

THE CORONATION OF THE POPE

STRANGE as the association may sound, the King of England and the Pope of Rome are now the only two sovereigns left in the world who receive their crowns at the hands of the Church, as the climax of a long ecclesiastical ceremony. Czardom has been swept away amid unspeakable horrors, and the gorgeous functions of the Kremlin, which in 1896 attracted so much attention amongst ardent Anglicans, will be witnessed no more. The Kingdom of Hungary has also ceased to be, and it is probable that Budapesth saw its last coronation when the Emperor Francis Joseph was crowned there in 1867. The short-lived German Empire was from the outset content with its *Huldigung* and sought no specially religious sanction to stimulate the veneration paid to the All-Highest. Spain, strange to say, though still Catholic, and one of the earliest countries in Europe to adopt the regal unction, abolished her ancient coronation ritual long ago. United Italy, hampered by the difficulties created with the Holy See by the forcible occupation of the patrimony of St. Peter, has never been in a position, even if she had wished to do so, to ask the blessing of the Church upon her newly-enthroned monarchs. Belgium and the Netherlands, both kingdoms of modern date, have not attempted to introduce a ritual with which the traditions of the people were in no particular sympathy.

There remains only Scandinavia; and here the trend of public opinion as manifested in the last half century is decidedly significant. In Sweden, when the present monarch, Gustaf V., succeeded to the throne in 1907, it was decided that no coronation ceremony should take place. *The Times* correspondent at Stockholm, in a communication which appeared in that journal on January 6, 1908, informs its readers:

The *Aftonblad*, publishes to-day an account of an interview with the King of Sweden, who is reported to have said that the decision not to let himself be crowned was taken on his own initiative, as he considers coronation an unnecessary ceremony, and one not in accordance with the spirit of the age. His Majesty further said that the ceremonial at the opening of Parliament

would also be simplified, as he had for a long time regarded it as antiquated. He added that so far as his personal inclinations were concerned, he wished for nothing better than to lead a simple and frugal life. That this principle could not always be carried out was due to the representative position of the ruler of the country.

Denmark had given up the ceremonial crowning of its kings at an even earlier date, but Norway, when, on recovering its independence in 1905, it elected the Danish prince Charles to occupy the Norwegian throne as King Haakon VII., decided that the new monarch should be crowned according to ancient precedent. Nevertheless, although the ceremony took place in the venerable cathedral of Trondhjem, and although the Bishop of Trondhjem anointed the hands and forehead of the newly-elected Sovereign, I can find no record that the King and Queen communicated at the Eucharistic service, as is done here in England. In any case, it is certain that in the central incident of the whole function, the significance of the rite as a divine consecration, an investiture with authority which the monarch holds as God's vicegerent, was entirely lost sight of. It was the Prime Minister, M. Michelsen, we are told, who "in evening dress and wearing the Order of St. Olaf," approached the altar at the climax of the ceremony. Then he, taking the crown from the altar, with the assistance of the Bishop, placed it upon the king's head. Further, we learn that the sceptre was delivered to King Haakon by the Minister for Foreign Affairs, while two other members of the Government brought him the orb and the sword. *The Times* special correspondent, to whom we owe this information, goes on to remark that "there are a considerable number of people in Norway who look on the coronation as a useless observance," and while he lets us know that the rite was shorn of many ceremonies that are still found in the corresponding English service, he strongly hints the likelihood that in future these formalities would be dispensed with altogether.

I am told [he writes] by many who are strenuous supporters of the monarchy that the present will be the last coronation. They oppose it not on religious grounds, but because the country is poor and the expense is considerable. Moreover the ceremony has been abolished in Denmark, and why should Norway maintain it?

It seems, therefore, to be strictly and literally true that out of all the many kingdoms into which Europe was divided at the beginning of the nineteenth century there remain only the monarch of Great Britain and the Pope, now shorn of all temporal sovereignty outside his tiny domain in the Leonine city, who can claim to hold their authority as something directly committed to them by Almighty God. They alone are truly *ποιμένες λαῶν*, shepherds acclaimed by their people and consecrated to the kingly office with all the most solemn sanctions which religious ceremonial can impart. This common inheritance in, and maintenance of, venerable traditions is not the only link which binds England and Rome together, but the fact may help, without further preamble, to awaken a certain interest in a Roman ceremonial which, while in many respects dissimilar, has certain features of resemblance with our own.

All coronation rituals contain among the elements of outstanding importance the following features: 1) The assent of the people expressed by their applause and shouts of joy; 2) the anointing of the monarch elect; 3) the delivery of certain insignia; 4) the imposing of the crown; 5) an Eucharistic service with Holy Communion; and 6) the homage of the nobility, great vassals and other important officers. In the case of the Pope the conditions are considerably modified by the fact that, as things are at present, he is almost always a bishop already, and that episcopal consecration is not and cannot be conferred again. The consequence is, that having been anointed when he was consecrated bishop, the Pope receives no further unction. Moreover, the number of the different insignia with which he has to be invested is much reduced, for he has already received many, *e.g.*, the crozier, the mitre and the ring, in the course of his episcopal consecration. Still, though the coronation of the Roman Pontiff, as a service, is less full of incident than our royal coronation in England, the features which remain bring us into touch with many curious customs of remote ages.

Let us begin with what are known as the *Laudes* (praises). After the collect and before the epistle of the Pontifical Mass, the senior Cardinal Deacon, with other ecclesiastical dignitaries, descends to that lower area in front of the High Altar of St. Peter's, which is known as the "Confession," and there they sing a kind of Litany. The Cardinal Deacon chants the words *Exaudi Christe* (graciously hear us O Christ). To

which the rest answer: "Long life to our most holy Lord Pius, appointed by God to be Supreme Pontiff and Universal Pope." This is repeated three times. Then the Deacon chants *Salvator Mundi* (O Saviour of the World), and answer is made, *Tu illum adjuva* (do Thou assist him). This also is repeated thrice. Then, "Sancta Maria, Sancte Michael," and a number of other saints in succession are invoked singly, the answer always being, as before, "do thou assist him," while *Kyrie eleison*, *Christe eleison*, *Kyrie eleison*, are added at the end of this short litany.

Simple as this little chant may appear, it takes us back to the earliest years of Christianity and to the very heart of the Roman Empire. To begin with, these *Laudes*, by their direct descent from earlier forms, which can easily be traced, undoubtedly represent the acclamations of the populace as they were wont to be expressed, in honour of the Emperors or of great ecclesiastics, from the second to the fifth century after Christ. In a manuscript copy of the *Laudes*, which can be accurately assigned to the time of Pope Nicholas I. and between the years 858 and 867, we find that they were sung, as they were sung in St. Peter's the other day, between the Collect and the Epistle of the Mass. They begin in exactly the same way, "Graciously hear us O Christ," and then "Long life to our most holy Lord Nicholas, appointed by God to be Supreme Pontiff and Universal Pope." But the "Praises" in this case are addressed, not only to Pope Nicholas, but also to the Emperor, Louis the Pious, and his family, and they end with a different phrase, often found elsewhere, "Christ conquers, Christ reigns, Christ commands."¹ Many times over we hear that such Praises were shouted in chorus to different pontiffs, not merely at their coronation or during solemn Mass, but on other quite secular occasions, whenever great enthusiasm was evoked. A particularly elaborate scheme of exactly similar *Laudes* addressed to the Emperor Charlemagne was printed by Mgr. Duchesne a good many years ago,² and it is noteworthy as containing, like many others of the same period, the acclamation already mentioned, *Christus vincit*, *Christus regnat*, *Christus imperat*. Travelling still further back, we find St. Augustine minutely and exactly recording the acclamations

¹ See *Revue Bénédictine*, 1897, p. 484. See also the late Father de Santi who treats the whole subject at some length in the *Civiltà Cattolica*, Aug. 15th, 1903.

² Duchesne, *Liber Pontificalis*, II. p. 37.

which greeted Bishop Heraclius, whom he had consecrated to be his successor in the year 426, and also those addressed to himself. The people chanted *Exaudi Christe, Augustino vita*—practically speaking, the same form as that used for the Pope to-day—sixteen times. But there were other salutations as well: "Thanks be to God, Praised be Christ"; this was said twenty-three times. "Thee for our Father, thee for our Bishop," twenty times. "Well deserving, truly worthy," five times; and so on to an immense length.¹ Similar details regarding the acclamations used when there was occasion for the expression of strong approval or dissent are met with in the acts of the great ecclesiastical councils, for example, at the Council of Chalcedon in 451. What is more, this curious method of expressing applause or disapproval was unquestionably of secular and pagan origin. The historians of the early Roman Emperors supply abundant details of such scenes. In the long account given by Vopiscus of the election of the Emperor Tacitus (A.D. 283) we are told that when Tacitus at first declined the honour in the senate on the score of his advanced age, "these were the acclamations of the senators, 'Trajan, too, came to rule the empire as an old man' (ten times); and 'Hadrian also came to rule in his old age' (ten times). . . . 'Do you give orders, let the soldiers fight' (thirty times); 'Severus said, it is the hand that reigns, not the feet' (thirty times); 'It is your mind, not your body, which we are electing' (twenty times); 'Tacitus Augustus, may the Gods keep you.'" Then Tacitus was taken out to the Campus Martius to be presented to the soldiers and the people. "Whereupon the people acclaimed: 'Most happily may the Gods keep thee, Tacitus,' and the rest which it is customary to say." In our earliest English coronation Order, known as the Egbertine, because it occurs in the so-called "Egbert Pontifical," we have a trace of the same type of salutation. The text is a little uncertain, but we probably should read it as follows: "Then let the whole people say three times along with the Bishops and the priests, 'May our King N. live for ever' (*Vivat Rex N. in sempiternum*), and he shall be confirmed upon the throne of the kingdom with the blessing of all the people while the great lords kiss him, saying: 'For ever, Amen, amen, amen.'" There is also in the Egbertine Order a sort of litany which

¹ Migne, P.S. XXXIII. 960, and Augustini Epistola 213 in the edition of the Vienna *Corpus Scriptorum*, pp. 372—379.

bears a resemblance to certain other acclamations traceable at the same period both in the east and in the west.

A still closer parallel to the papal *Laudes* is to be found in a copy of the acclamations sung after the hallowing of Queen Matilda, the wife of William the Conqueror, in 1068. These are simply an adaptation of the *Laudes* addressed to Charlemagne. The Blessed Trinity and the Saints are called upon in turn, as in a litany, with the invocation *tu illum adjuva* (do thou assist him—or her), while the ejaculation *Christus vincit, Christus regnat, Christus imperat* is used as a kind of refrain.

As has already been said, the delivery of the various insignia, which plays so prominent a part in the older royal and imperial coronations, is a feature almost entirely wanting in the coronation of a Pope. There is, however, the investiture with the pallium, which takes place at the outset of the ceremony, as soon as the Confiteor of the Mass has been recited. The pallium, as the formula which is pronounced by the Senior Cardinal Deacon expressly states, represents the fulness of the pontifical office. It is now a simple band or loose collar of white lamb's-wool marked with black crosses and with a short pendant hanging down both in front and behind. It is fixed in its place with three jewelled pins. This very unpretentious ornament, which has remained since pre-Reformation days the most conspicuous feature in the arms of the See of Canterbury, is conferred by the Pope with many formalities upon Archbishops who possess jurisdiction, but in the ordinary course is not given to simple bishops. The material of which it is made, white lamb's-wool, no doubt bears reference to our Saviour's charge to St. Peter, "Feed my lambs." Every year, on the feast of St. Agnes, while the choir are singing the antiphon, *Stans a dextris eius agnus nive candidior* in her church in the Via Nomentana outside Rome, two lambs are offered at the sanctuary rails. The lambs are placed upon the altar, blessed and then given into the care of some nuns until the proper time comes for shearing them. Then their wool is taken and woven into pallia by the nuns of the Convent of Torre de' Specchi. Early in the morning on the vigil of SS. Peter and Paul, the new pallia are laid upon the altar in the "Confession" of St. Peter's, *i.e.*, the crypt in which reposes the body of the Apostle. They are blessed—when possible, by the Pope himself—on the same day. When the consecration is

completed they are left in a silver-gilt coffer in the closest proximity to the tomb of the Apostle, in order that the words in the form for conferring the pallium upon archbishops may be verified as literally as possible—*Tradimus tibi pallium de corpore beati Petri sumptum* (we confer upon thee the pallium taken from the body of Blessed Peter). From various archæological and historical considerations it seems beyond dispute that in its origin the pallium is identical with the highly-ornamental official scarf which is so conspicuous an object in most of the consular diptychs. What we know for certain is that the Popes, even before the time of St. Gregory the Great, were allowed to wear the pallium, and with the Emperor's sanction, to confer it under due restrictions upon other bishops. The terms of St. Gregory's letter, in which he bestowed the pallium upon St. Augustine of England, are still preserved to us. It is also not impossible that the curious garment which still figures in the English coronation service and seems sometimes to be described as a stole and sometimes as armlets, may represent another development of the gorgeous scarf seen in the diptychs which curiously, under the name of *lorum*,¹ is also referred to as presented to St. Silvester in the forged Donation of Constantine:

In return for which (*i.e.*, in gratitude for his Baptism) to those same Holy Apostles Saint Peter and Saint Paul, and through them also to St. Silvester, our Father . . . and to all the Pontiffs his successors . . . we concede and by these presents do confer our imperial Lateran palace, which is preferred to and ranks higher than all the palaces in the whole world; then a diadem, that is to say the crown worn on our own head, and with it the *frigium* [*i.e.*, a Phrygian head-dress, supposed to be the primitive cap out of which the tiara developed] and also the shoulder cloth (*superhumeralem*), to wit the *lorum*, which is wont to encircle our imperial neck,—and also the purple mantle . . . sceptres, etc.

Spurious as this document is, it was undoubtedly fabricated before the end of the eighth century, and is reliable evidence for the usages and beliefs of the period at which it was concocted.

¹ The word in this sense is rare, and it is not certain whether the proper form is *lorus* or *lorum*. It seems to have been a rich, but attenuated Roman Toga, and was originally wrapped round the body as the Toga was wrapped round the body, a great length of it hanging vertically down in front.

As for the central feature of the papal ceremony, the bestowal of the triple crown, it must be confessed that the early history of this ornament is extraordinarily obscure. From the names used to designate the pontifical head-dress in early times—*camelaucum*, *phrygium*, *camaurum*, *tiara*—it seems probable, as M. Eugène Müntz¹ and others have argued, that the object so described, which seems to have been distinct from the ordinary bishop's mitre, was of oriental origin. We do not even know with any certainty how far back we can trace the ceremony of the crowning, for the ninth *Ordo Romanus*, which some think to be of the ninth century, or even earlier, is assigned by others to the eleventh.² The forged Donation of Constantine, which probably describes the practices of the time when it was fabricated, *i.e.*, the latter part of the eighth century, seems to imply that a plain white *phrygium* was worn by the Pope in processions, but that St. Silvester had emphatically rejected the idea of encircling it with a gold crown.³ Benzo, that very reckless and untrustworthy assailant of Hildebrand, writes in such terms as might seem to imply that when, in the middle of the eleventh century, Pope Nicholas II. had a king's crown set upon his head, the bishops were so scandalized that they fainted with horror (*facti sunt velut mortui*).⁴ But what the precise point was which Benzo deemed so scandalous, whether it was that the Pope wore a crown at all, or that it was like a royal crown, or that it was set upon his head in the synod, is by no means clear. One thing is tolerably certain, *viz.*, that the earliest graphic and plastic representations of the papal head-dress, belonging to the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, show a rather tall conical cap with a single coronet

¹ Müntz, "La Tiare pontificale," in the *Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions*, Tome xxxvi. 1897.

² See Kösters, *Studien zu Mabillons Romani Ordines* (1905). Grisar, however, declares that the ninth *Ordo Romanus* is found in a MS. of the ninth century.

³ The Donation speaks as follows: "We also have decreed this that the same Venerable Man, our Father Silvester, the Supreme Pontiff, and all his successors . . . might use and bear upon their heads . . . the diadem, that is the crown, which we have granted him from our own head, of purest gold and precious gems. But he, the most holy Pope, did not at all allow that crown of gold to be used over the clerical tonsure (*corona*) which he wears to the glory of St. Peter, but we placed upon his most holy head with our own hands a *frigium* of gleaming splendour, representing the glorious resurrection of our Lord. And holding the bridle of his horse, out of reverence for St. Peter, we performed for him the duty of groom, decreeing that all the pontiffs his successors, and they alone, may use that *frigium* in processions."

⁴ *Monumenta Germaniae Historica* (Scriptores), XI. p. 672.

of gold round its base. This is the type exhibited in the frescoes of Giotto, as, for example, that at the Lateran representing Pope Boniface VIII. proclaiming the Jubilee of 1300, and this is also what we find in the miniatures of manuscripts of earlier date. The addition of a second crown or coronet seems probably to have been due to Boniface himself owing perhaps to his theory of the two swords. The third circlet appeared very soon afterwards; and in nearly all the tombs of the Popes, and in almost every work of art after the middle of the fourteenth century the three crowns became a distinctive attribute of the papacy. A brief but rather interesting account has been preserved to us by an English witness, one Adam of Usk, of the *Sede Vacante* of 1404, and of the celebrations which followed the election of the new Pope. Adam was an Auditor of the Rota and present in Rome at the time, so that his account ought to be reliable:

On the feast of St. Martin the new Pope went down from the Palace to the old Church of St. Peter for the ceremony of his Coronation, and at the altar of St. Gregory, the auditors bringing the vestments, he was robed for the Mass. And at the moment of his coming forth from the Chapel of St. Gregory, the clerk of his chapel, bearing a long rod on the end of which was fixed some tow, cried aloud as he set it aflame: "Holy Father, thus passeth the glory of the world;" and again, in the middle of the procession, with a louder voice,¹ thus twice: "Holy Father! Most Holy Father!" and a third time, on arriving at the altar of St. Peter, thrice: "Holy Father! Holy Father! Holy Father!" at the loudest; and forthwith each time is the tow quenched.² Just as in the coronation of the Emperor, in the very noontide of his glory, stones of every kind and colour, worked with all the cunning of the craft, are wont to be presented to him by the stone-cutters, with these words: "Most excellent prince, of what kind of stone wilt thou that thy tomb be made?" Also the new Pope, the Mass being ended, ascends a lofty stage made for this purpose, and there he is solemnly crowned with the triple golden crown by the Cardinal of Ostia, as Dean of the College. The first crown means power in temporal things; the second, fatherhood in things spiritual; the third, pre-eminence in things of Heaven. And afterwards, still robed in the same white vestments, he, as well as all the prelates likewise in albs, rides thence through Rome to the Church of St. John Lateran, the cathedral seat of the Pope.

¹ *Altiori voce*. Possibly this means in a higher pitch.

² This ceremony is still retained at the present day.

Adam of Usk's attempted explanation of the symbolism of the triple crown is only one of many which have been propounded. All are probably *ex post facto*, and the writers who suggest that the allusion is to the authority of the Vicar of Christ over the Church Militant, Suffering and Triumphant, or again to his function as Priest, Shepherd and Teacher of the Faithful, are simply drawing upon their imagination regardless even of intrinsic probability. The one point of which we may be reasonably certain is that the use of the triple crown has reference rather to the Pope's authority as a temporal ruler than as spiritual father of the Faithful. The fact that the coronation was of old performed under a canopy outside the church, and after the building of the new St. Peter's took place in the great loggia over the central doorway, shows that the acclamations of the people, just as in an English coronation, were expected to play their part in the impressive scene. Indeed, in some of the early *Ordos*, a direction is contained that before the coronation takes place time should be given to allow the people to find their way out of the church into the open *piazza*.

Finally, it may not be out of place to point out, as an early link between English kingship and the Papacy, that Alfred the Great, the wisest and most patriotic, if not the holiest, of all our native monarchs, was in his childhood anointed King at Rome by Pope Leo IV. More than twenty years ago I discussed this matter at length in the pages of *THE MONTH*,¹ and I ventured to urge that the *consulatus cingulum* with which, as Pope Leo himself wrote, the boy was invested, was identical with that same *lorum* which appears in papal coronations as the pallium, and in our English ceremony as the armill² and possibly the sword-belt.

HERBERT THURSTON.

¹ See *THE MONTH*, Oct., 1901.

² Dr. F. S. Brightman in his article "Coronations," in *Ollard's Dictionary of English Church History*, also identifies himself with this view.

IS MR. BERTRAND RUSSELL BECOMING ARISTOTELIAN ?¹

SINCE the mind which the psychologist introspects, experiments upon, analyses, is presumably the same to-day as it was in the days of Aristotle or Aquinas, at least in its main characteristics, an analysis of mind should, if correctly performed, lead to results which will be fundamentally the same in all ages. Due allowance being made for the mathematical bias with which Mr. Russell starts, and for changes in terminology, what he finds in the human mind is not so very unlike what was found therein by the ancients. The theories by which he seeks to explain facts are in some cases very different, but the facts which his analysis reveals are—*mutatis mutandis* in the matter of terminology—more or less what one trained in the traditional methods of the Schoolmen would expect them to be.

Thus Mr. Russell finds that the current classification of mental activities under the three heads of cognitive, affective and conative is unsound. Pain and pleasure are not separate mental occurrences, but properties of such experiences as would be called respectively uncomfortable and pleasant (p. 71). They have no "intrinsic" quality which justifies us in making of them a separate type. In like manner "the ingredients of an emotion are only sensations and images and bodily movements succeeding each other according to a certain pattern" (p. 284). The expressions "pattern" and "ingredients" sound a little crude; but substantially the findings of Mr. Russell are those of the Aristotelian and not those of the Kantian school.

Again, Mr. Russell does not analyse mind from the point of view of consciousness, but rather from that of function—a truly Scholastic principle, though somewhat distorted in Mr. Russell's case by his proneness to treat mind, like geometry, as a set of inter-related points. The Scholastic had no term for "consciousness," and Mr. Russell has no use for this term. Not all mental processes are conscious by any means! Neither is volition the main function of mind,

¹ *The Analysis of Mind*. By Bertrand Russell, F.R.S. (George Allen & Unwin, 1921, pp. 310).

if we may judge by the scant treatment it receives in Mr. Russell's work. One lecture out of fifteen is assigned to "Emotions and Will," and this a short one (Lect. xiv., pp. 279—287). For the rest, the author of the "Analysis of Mind" is almost exclusively occupied with the function of cognition.

But most striking of all the similarities between the findings of Mr. Russell and those of the Scholastics, of whose labours I suspect him to be blissfully ignorant, is the fact that, though he plainly dislikes the idea of cause, he is none the less constrained by his examination of the processes of cognition to adopt a causal theory of knowledge. First of all, he finds that sensation is the source of all our knowledge (p. 141, cf. p. 299), which is but another way of saying: *Nihil est in intellectu quod non fuit prius in sensu*. Secondly, he maintains with the Scholastics that in knowledge proper reality is active and mind passive. A sensation is one of the appearances of an object, that one which, having been transmitted through space as a "perspective," produces a corresponding modification in the nervous system and brain. This is the "engram," or as the Scholastic would say, the *species impressa*. As it fades, what it leaves behind is the "image," which is thus a "copy" of its prototype, the sensation. All this is in essence pure Scholasticism.

It follows that "truth" is not "coherence," but "correspondence" between judgment or belief and fact. Mr. Russell is emphatic on this point. There is correspondence not only with regard to images, but also with regard to words; correspondence not only in simple cases, such as the memory-image, but also in respect to associations. Combine this with the no less emphatic statement that knowledge is dependent upon causal relations, and we seem to have the echo of another Scholastic dictum: *Omne agens agit sibi simile*. Truth, for Mr. Russell as for the Scholastics, exists when, and in so far as, reality reproduces itself in the mind of the observer.

Less satisfactory is Mr. Russell's account of the universal concept. He holds with us that neither sensations nor images are formally true unless referred to reality in the judgment. He also regards the truth of a proposition to be dependent, not upon a direct correspondence between fact and word, but upon a correspondence between fact and the images which words symbolize. But he cannot find anything more

"general" in his analysis of mind than that mythical entity, the "generic image." He discovers "no single contents which can be called abstract ideas" (p. 218). "A universal never appears before the mind as a single object in the sort of way that something perceived appears" (p. 228). While a "word becomes general by being made the sign of several particular ideas" (p. 217).

I cannot but think that Mr. Russell has been looking for abstract ideas in the wrong way, even perhaps looking for the wrong thing. He has been using a microscope, which is an excellent instrument for discovering structure, but alone is quite inadequate to reveal function. For while, on the one hand, he thinks that "a vague image may well have a meaning which is general" (p. 208), he admits that there is a distinction between the vague and the general" (p. 184), and that this distinction is one of function" (p. 221). He also states that a general word is used to signify "the several members of a class . . . assembled together in virtue of some similarity or common property" (p. 194). But he does not seem to realize that this function of recognizing common properties and assembling individuals into classes on account of them, is a function of mind, and a distinctive and most important function of mind, in character quite different from that of mere feeling or mere imagination, which functions do not, as such, involve knowledge and, as such, give us neither truth nor error.

Nor does the use of general words necessarily involve the use of images. Thinking may depend "at least in its origin upon images" (p. 202); and "the meaning of images" may thus be "more primitive than the meanings of words" (p. 207), so that it is through their connection with images that words "bring us into touch with what is remote in time and space" (p. 203). Yet there is apparently, as Mr. Russell acknowledges, "imageless thinking" (p. 226).

What, then, is this "imageless thinking"? Is it the mere use of words without any understanding of their meaning, of the "classes" they denote, or of the properties in virtue of which different objects have been grouped in one class? Almost Mr. Russell seems to answer, Yes. For he tells us that "there is no more reason why a person who uses a word correctly should be able to tell what it means than there is why a planet which is moving correctly should know Kepler's laws" (p. 199). "The meaning of a word, unlike that of

an image, is wholly constituted by mnemonic causal laws, and not in any degree by likeness (except in exceptional cases). . . . If a word has the right associations with other objects (other than images, that is), we shall be able to use it correctly, and understand its use by others, even if it evokes no image" (p. 210).

Are we, then, to suppose that, when Mr. Russell wrote his *Principles of Mathematics*, he did so, like a planet, without understanding what he was doing; that what he wrote can be adequately accounted for by the verbal associations which have been formed in his brain? Or, is he an "exception," as we hope that we, too, and most of our colleagues may be? If so, the exceptions would seem to be much more interesting, and even more valuable, than the rule; and it will not be irrelevant to ask what constitutes an intelligent, as opposed to a *mere*, association of words, nor unimportant to inquire what accounts for the difference.

"When the word is being first learnt, you may associate it with an object, which is what it 'means,'" says Mr. Russell (p. 200). The word thus "acquires, through association, some of the same causal efficacy as the object" (*Ib.*). So that in the case of words, as well as of images, "there are certain respects, notably associations, in which (their) effects resemble those of their prototypes," which effects, if they are "those shared by objects of a certain kind" render the meaning of the image or word general" (p. 209).

There is, therefore, a resemblance, if not between words and their objects, at any rate between the associations or mnemonic effects of words and the associations and causal effects of objects,—a functional resemblance, which, if it exists, gives meaning to words and differentiates intelligible speech from nonsense. That function of mind by which it isolates the common property to which a word becomes attached, is what we mean by abstraction, and the property, thus mentally isolated, and held functionally at the disposal of the thinker, is what we mean by an abstract idea. While the function of mind by which properties, thus isolated, are regrouped in a systematic whole, is conception, the individual operations which contribute to the regrouping being judgments.

With the exception of judgment, which he treats of under the heading of "belief," Mr. Russell ignores these important mental functions, as he also ignores the fact that the concept formed by judgment and elaborated by subsequent judg-

ments, functions mentally as a unit, and functions intelligibly, —not as a mere word, linked by association with other words, but as a sign the significance of which may be understood by others *because it is a sign*, and may also be verified in experience. Whether we can think without words, as well as without images, is questionable, and for this reason I will not dispute Mr. Russell's contention that introspection reveals no mental constituent in thinking over and above the image and the word. But if the concept be the word, it is no mere word, but a significant *verbum mentale*, which all words are not; and its function in thought, though dependent upon association, is no mere association, but one that is controlled by an intelligence which has grasped the significance of words, which understands them, and can use them intelligibly because it understands them, and because in understanding them, the objects they signify are present to intelligence and control its operations.

Mr. Russell is continually falling into the error of treating the mind as if it were a potato-patch, out of which can be dug separate and additive units, instead of treating it as an organic, living whole. Though he realizes full well the difference between a dynamical law and a law of perspective, between mnemonic and mechanical processes, between formal and functional grouping, he is constantly lapsing from the functional into the atomic standpoint. The aim of his analysis is to discover "ingredients," whereas it should be to discover vital operations and the conditions such operations presuppose.

Thus in his criticism of Meinong's analysis of thought into "act, content, and object," he complains that empirically he cannot "discover anything corresponding to the supposed act." To him it is, therefore, both "unnecessary and fictitious." "The occurrence of the content of a thought constitutes the occurrence of the thought" (pp. 17, 18).

Precisely; yet a thought is none the less an occurrence, a happening to some mind or other, implying an activity on its part which is not expressed by the term "content." The capacity of mind to respond to stimuli of a certain character has been realized: the thought, while it occurs, is an actual existent. Mr. Russell, in fact, is not consistent here, for in his analysis of belief, he distinguishes "believing" from "the content believed," and even affirms that there is a relation between them "of the sort expressed by saying that the

content is what is believed" (p. 250). He also admits that "we can be aware of an awareness" (p. 116).

I think Mr. Russell is wrong in distinguishing "believing" from the content believed, as if they were different entities. They are but different aspects of one and the same mental function, the term "believing" expressing the fact that belief is a mental operation, while the term "content" informs us that this operation has reference to a fact, of which it is the mental expression. But having admitted this distinction in the case of belief, it is difficult to see why Mr. Russell should deny it in the case of memory, especially as he confesses that, except for this *aux pas*, "the whole problem of memory would have been comparatively simple" (p. 163).

Old terms, when they express realities, have an uncomfortable way of bobbing up again, in spite of attempts on the part of empiricists to suppress them. Mr. Russell has a horror of metaphysics, and especially, it would seem, of the metaphysical notions of substance and soul. An "act" is to him "the ghost of the subject, or what was once the full-blooded soul" (p. 18). Therefore, he suppresses it, together with substance and soul; but only that they, like it, may reappear again, as we shall presently see.

One of the main purposes of Mr. Russell's lectures is "to give grounds for the belief that the distinction between mind and matter is not so fundamental as is commonly supposed" (p. 108). This purpose he seeks to carry out by first denying that sensations are conscious, then making a "bundle" of them, and assuring us that this bundle of sensations or appearances, inter-related by the laws of perspective and again in the time-series by dynamical laws, constitutes what we call a thing. Things have thus apparently vanished, leaving us with only a bundle of appearances, which, when they happen "where there is a brain (or, in the lower animals, some suitable nervous structure), with sense-organs and nerves forming part of the intervening medium," are perceptions (p. 131, cf. p. 104). It only remains to show that desire, emotion, volition, memory, judgment, belief are, if not themselves sensations, at any rate composed either of sensations, or of images which are but copies of sensations (cf. p. 121), and the proof is complete. The "subject" has disappeared no less in the case of mind than in that of matter. All that remains are "appearances" which are perspectives or sensations according as they are grouped in an "active

place" (the thing) or a "passive place" (the mind) (p. 105).

"I believe," says Mr. Russell, "that sensations (including images) supply all the 'stuff' of the mind, and that everything else can be analysed into groups of sensations related in various ways, or characteristics of sensations or groups of sensations" (p. 69, cf. p. 109). "I (also) contend that the ultimate constituents of matter are not atoms or electrons, but sensations, and other things similar to sensations as regards extent and duration" (p. 121).

Apparently matter and mind, things and souls, have vanished. They are styled throughout the book "logical constructions," or in more ironical moments "logical fictions." Yet their disappearance is only apparent. There still remain those curious entities "active" and "passive places." On these Mr. Russell insists to the end. He says on the last page but one of his book (p. 307):

Physics and psychology are not distinguished by their material. Mind and matter alike are logical constructions; the particulars out of which they are constructed, or from which they are inferred, have various relations, some of which are studied by physics, others by psychology. Broadly speaking, physics group particulars by their active places, psychology by their passive places.

Appearances are in Mr. Russell's theory propagated in all directions more or less as waves of light are propagated, and the centres from which they are propagated he calls their "active place" (pp. 133, 134). Aristotle has precisely the same notion, but calls it a "first substance," which in the logical order is that of which appearances (or species) are predicated, and in the real order is that from which they arise. The term "subject" is identical with substance, but is ordinarily restricted to the logical significance of this word. In Mr. Russell's philosophy the notion of substance is no less fundamental than it is in that of Aristotle. He has merely, in deference to widespread English prejudice, changed the name. "Place" for Aristotle was a derivative and complex concept involving a system of geometry by which boundaries and positions could be assigned. For us, since the days of Newton, it has become an ultimate and irresolvable notion, so Mr. Russell adopts it in the vain hope that by assigning to it the function of substance, without the name, he may persuade us that his philosophy is non-metaphysical:

The subject [says Mr. Russell] appears to be a logical fiction, like mathematical points and instants. It is introduced not because observation reveals it, but because it is linguistically convenient and apparently demanded by grammar. Nominal entities of this sort may or may not exist, but there is no good ground for supposing that they do. The functions that they appear to perform can always be performed by classes or series or other logical constructions, consisting of less dubious entities. If we are to avoid a perfectly gratuitous assumption, we must dispense with the subject as one of the actual ingredients of the world (pp. 141, 142).

But Mr. Russell does not in fact dispense with this perfectly gratuitous assumption. On the contrary, he assures us that "the physical world itself, as known, is infected through and through with subjectivity" (p. 230, cf. p. 130), and that "the diversity of points of view which we have been accustomed to regard as distinctively psychological" is just as much characteristic of photographic plates, and indeed of all places, whether active or passive, as it is of that particular passive place which we are accustomed to term "mind" (pp. 131, 230). He can also continue to speak of "my experience," and even vouchsafes to define it (p. 170).

The function which the "subject" or "first substance" performed in Aristotelian philosophy is not, in point of fact, performed by Mr. Russell's "classes or series or other logical constructions": it is performed by his "active and passive places." For Mr. Russell the function of the "class" and "series" of appearances or particulars is to define in the one case the mind and in the other case the thing. This function is performed in Aristotle's philosophy by the "second substance" or "essence" and the "accidents" which flow from it. The accidents which, in so far as they are apparent, came later on to be termed "species," are Mr. Russell's "regular appearances" (pp. 134, 135), those appearances, namely, which are unaffected by the distorting influence of an intervening medium. The essence is that law of causation, which he describes as "entirely internal to the system" (p. 134), and which presumably arises from the activity of "place." The connection between the activity of places and the laws of perspective and dynamical laws which inter-relate the appearances that places give rise to, or receive, as in a focal centre, Mr. Russell does not explain. But except for this and the strangeness of his new termin-

ology, his scheme of the universe and the Aristotelian scheme are strikingly similar. So far from getting rid of the dread notion of substance, beneath the diaphanous clothing of his "active and passive places" and the laws of his appearances' behaviour Aristotle's substance, both in its primary and secondary sense, is plainly visible. Appearances, as Mr. Russell recognizes, must be appearances of something and appearances to somebody, even if that body be nothing more than a few chemicals grouped together on a piece of common glass.

Has, then, Mr. Russell succeeded in proving his main thesis as to the identity of mind and matter, at any rate with respect to their common substratum? His analysis is both brilliant and clear, but his arguments seem to me to rest largely on the ambiguity of the terminology he adopts or invents.

The main argument briefly is this: all mental phenomena *and* all physical phenomena are ultimately reducible to sensations. Therefore, sensations are the ultimate "stuff" out of which mind and matter are compounded. In order to equate physical phenomena with sensations, Mr. Russell is forced to postulate, not only that sensations *may* be (p. 288), but that they *must* be unconscious (p. 292). They can only become conscious in his theory when copied by images. Mr. Russell allows that at first sight one is inclined to agree with Dr. Henry Head that "sensation, in the strict sense of the term, demands the existence of consciousness" (p. 288). But to this he replies that whereas consciousness must needs be *of* something, sensations are conscious of nothing" (p. 289). This lands him in serious difficulties when he comes to treat of the consciousness *of* images" (pp. 141, 290). Having persuaded himself that the "subject" of consciousness has been disposed of, in order to explain how an image, A, may become conscious, he is forced to reintroduce a subject of consciousness in the shape of another image, B, which is conscious of the first (p. 291). He has apparently forgotten that at an earlier stage he has affirmed that while *we*, self-conscious beings, may be aware of our awareness, "there is nothing odd in the hypothesis of beings which are aware of objects, but not of their own awareness; it is, indeed, highly probable that young children and higher animals are such beings" (pp. 115, 116). For, this being granted, his argument for "unconscious sensations" breaks down. He can no longer maintain that "actual sensations, in themselves,

are not cases of consciousness" on the ground that they do not bring in that "reference to what is absent," which it is "the essential practical function" of consciousness to introduce" (p. 292). For either the consciousness of animals has *not* this reference to what is absent, in which case they cannot be aware of objects at all, or else it *has* this reference to what is absent, in which case animals can become conscious of objects without becoming aware of their own sensations.

A further argument for the unconsciousness of sensations is derived from the findings of psycho-analysts. They are supposed to have established the existence of "unconscious beliefs and unconscious desires," whence, Mr. Russell argues, "there is, so far as I can see, no class of mental or other occurrences of which we are always conscious whenever they happen" (p. 288).

Far be it from us to dispute Mr. Russell's assertion that there are unconscious mental processes. There may be, but at least we would urge that Mr. Russell's proof of their existence from the data provided by psycho-analysis, is fallacious. What the psycho-analyst has shown is not, as Mr. Russell's argument supposes, the existence of unconscious *desires*, but—a very different thing—the existence of unconscious impulses, which may be, and probably are, physiological, not psychological, in both origin and character.

Most people believe [says Mr. Russell] that we can know "our desires" by an immediate self-knowledge which does not depend upon our actions. Yet, if this were the case, it would be odd that people are so often mistaken as to what they desire. It is a matter of common observation that "so-and-so does not know his own motives" (pp. 30, 31).

Just so; but a motive is not a desire. It is anything that either stimulates or inhibits action; and so may be either conscious or unconscious, a physical impulse, an instinctive tendency, a habit, *or* a purpose of which we are conscious, an ideal which we think of and of which we feel the attraction. There *are* "causal laws of behaviour" (p. 38), of which we are quite unconscious—*more*, probably, than is commonly imagined—but Mr. Russell must first show that these laws are mental in character if he would use them as a proof of unconscious mental processes. All he does, however, is to dub such laws "unconscious desires," and then to argue that

consciousness is not a universal characteristic of mental phenomena because desires are mental phenomena, and some phenomena that *he* calls desires are unconscious.

Mr. Russell's main purpose of proving that mind and matter are not so unlike as many people imagine is one with which we are wholly in sympathy, but we doubt if this purpose can be attained by the mere invention of a new terminology, or the use of old terms in a new and strained sense. Whether mind and matter be logical constructions or not, they at any rate have the *primary* characteristic of reality, for *both* of them "can do things to us without our voluntary co-operation" (p. 186), as the physicist and the psychoanalyst attest. We submit, therefore, that they should be treated with that feeling which is due to reality, namely, "a feeling akin to respect" (*Ib.*).

LESLIE J. WALKER.

THE GREAT PROTESTANT TRADITION AND CERTAIN POETS

"No conceivable absurdities can surpass the absurdities which are firmly believed of Catholics by sensible, kind-hearted, well-intentioned Protestants."
—*J. H. Newman.*

LITTLE sympathy for the old religion is to be looked for, and less understanding of it, in English early nineteenth century poets, before the revival of Catholicism in English life and thought, before the revolution in the English treatment of the history of the Reformation plunder, and before frequent turnings to Catholic ideals—if not to recognizing the safeguards of these through Catholic authority—by those who care about saving the lives of individuals, and the life of society, from pleasure-seeking, self-indulgence, and decay.

Nevertheless, however unsympathetic, however unenlightened, however prejudiced, were good men like Southey, Scott, and Wordsworth, yet they are more on the side of a Catholic civilized State, than are men of the anti-dogmatic revolution, in theory, with its effect on looser practice; men such as Byron and Shelley, those denouncers of Catholic Ireland's rulers, those enthusiasts for some renewing of that Ireland by overthrow of its religion and of its old-time reverence for birth though not for mere rank. (And yet, by the way, as to Byron, Scott thought he might end in Roman Catholicism, Byron's "best form of Christianity, as it is certainly the oldest.")

If ever there was a good man, a good friend, a good husband, father, and patriot, it was Robert Southey; the best man they ever knew, some said. Southey maintained that he did not hate Ireland. But he would make no concessions to the religion of the "wild Irish," as he called them.

Nothing can redeem that country but such measures as none of our statesmen, except perhaps the Duke of Wellington, would be hardy enough to adopt—nothing but a system of Roman conquest and colonization, and shipping off the refractory to the colonies. England [the words are consecutive] condescends too much to the Catholic religion.

Following in that way of talking,—with an ideal before

one; and, when one's own interest or prejudice is concerned, acting against that ideal—Southey wrote (in 1801):

Decidedly as my own principles lead to *toleration*, I yet think, in the sufferance of converts and proselytism, it has been carried too far. You might as well let a fire burn or a pestilence spread, as suffer the propagation of popery. I hate and abhor it from the bottom of my soul; and the only antidote is poison. . . . The monastic establishments ought to be dissolved; as for the priests, they will, for the most part, find their way to France; those who remain should not be suffered to recruit, and would soon die away in peace.

Southey prescribed thus, for nearer home, when actually writing in the Spanish peninsula, which he knew, as he did not know Ireland, and where he recognized the courage and devotion given by their Catholic religion to both priests and people in defending their country against the armies of the anti-Christian France of the Peninsular War. Which is what Wordsworth also says, in the same connection; writing more generally, on the peculiar power of the Catholic religion to resist adversity.

But, for England and Ireland, Southey, in 1823, protests against Catholic Emancipation, that

Our constitution consists of Church and State; and it is an absurdity in politics to give those persons power in the *State*, whose duty it is to subvert the *Church*. This argument is unanswerable. It may as well be said that a Jew has a right to be a bishop, as that the Roman Catholic has a right to a seat in the British Legislature; his opinions disqualify him.

The poet historian might, becomingly, have added, as qualifying words, "the *modern* British Legislature, the Protestantized"; for, surely, that legislature was founded by Roman Catholics, with a basis in the work of that pilgrim to Rome, King Alfred, in the laws of that Roman devotee, St. Edward the Confessor, its structure rising under the imperial Plantagenet calling himself a dutiful son of the Roman Bishop, in things spiritual, as fully as did his contemporary, the canonized King Louis of France.

When Emancipation was passed in 1829, Southey had

never heard one argument in favour of this suicidal concession which deserved to be called anything better than *cackle*. . . . It is mortifying to be *cackled* out of that constitution which was

purchased so hardly. Two days [he said] should be marked with black in the Irish Kalendar, . . . that on which the elective franchise was given to the Roman Catholics, and that in which a Protestant Government gave its sanction and support to a seminary for the Romish Priesthood. I know not which was the insaner measure.

It had been Southey's opinion during the agitation that

the people of Ireland care nothing for emancipation—why should they? But make it a question for restoring the Catholic Church, and they will enter into it as zealously as ever our ancestors did into a crusade.

Look at Ireland [cried his fellow anti-Emancipator, Wordsworth], look at the disproportion between her Catholic and Protestant population. . . . Look at the revenues of the Protestant Church; her cathedrals, her churches, that once belonged to the Romanists, and where, *in imagination*, their worship has never ceased to be celebrated. Can it be doubted that when the yet existing restrictions are removed, . . . plans will be set on foot for effecting an overthrow of the wealth of the Protestant Church, and, if possible, a transfer.

There were no delusions in Wordsworth's mind, or in Southey's, as to continuity between their Establishment and the pre-Reformation Catholic Church; or as to "Romanists" not being that Church's representatives.

To Wordsworth, in prose—notwithstanding his poetry on

Saintly Fisher and unbending More—

a St. Edward, as an Edward no-saint, were "men of this soul-degrading faith." He would not allow any man "to keep the king's conscience, who has not his own in his keeping." What a dull reflection on a Lord Chancellor Thomas More, and his relation to that which a King Henry the Eighth called his own conscience's "tender place." And yet, in poetry again, Wordsworth records

hooded Cenobites, . . .

. . . . unambitious Men,
Counsellors for the world, of piercing ken;
Whose fervent exhortations from afar
Move princes to their duty, peace or war.

One may here confess, for Wordsworth (as the poet and pamphleteer Milton confessed, for himself), that in prose he has the use but of his left hand, "wherein I confess myself inferior to myself, being called by the genial power of Nature to another task"—poetry. Yet, with no Miltonic fanaticism,

Wordsworth, in sympathetic prose, did scorn the expedient of a payment plan (in 1829) for the Irish Catholic clergy:

The Government acting on this policy would degrade itself by offering bribes to men of a sacred calling to act contrary to their sense of duty. If they be sincere, as priests and truly spiritual-minded, they will find it impossible to accept of a stipend, known to be granted with such expectations.¹ If they be worldlings and false of heart, they will practise double dealings, and seem to support the Government, while they are actually undermining it; for they know, that if they be suspected of sacrificing the interests of the Church, they will lose all authority over their flocks.

But on Emancipation Wordsworth held out, with Southey, for Church and State:

This "great Catholic interest" we are about to embody in a legislative form. A Protestant Parliament is to turn itself into a canine monster with two heads, which instead of keeping watch and ward, will be snarling at and bent on devouring each other.

Be it said, that while Southey and Wordsworth wrote so earnestly, not to say viciously, against "Catholic Emancipation," they would not, in penal-law fashion, prevent Catholics from worshipping God according to the way of their fathers. And, of course, the distinction they made, between freedom for worship and equal political rights—things united in our idea of modern political liberty or toleration—is something to be kept clear in mind. And there is much to be said for the ideal of a State governing according to the teaching of one religion, with consequent acceptance of a code of morals deciding definitely what is right or of high utility. That was the ideal of Catholic Christendom. After the Reformation, came the truncated ideal of the State cut off from Catholic communion, with its *Cujus regio hujus religio*. Gradually, the Protestantized English State admitted dissenters from the national religion; and then, Catholics. There, a

¹ Compare Burke on the endowment of Maynooth, unless the Church had control of its studies and discipline: "I would much rather trust to God's good providence and the contributions of your own people"—he was writing to Dr. Hussey, Maynooth's first president—"than to put into the hands of your implacable enemies the fountains of your morals and religion. If you consent to put your clerical education, or any other part of your education, under their direction or control, then you will have sold your religion for their money. . . . Be assured they never did and never will give one shilling for any other purpose than to do you mischief."

mid-nineteenth century Dr. Arnold of Rugby drew the line, and protested against admitting Jews. Then, in our own days, came a protest against admitting to parliament an atheist who would not take an oath in the name of God. And even now—well, a Mormon in the United States cannot claim legislation giving freedom for his polygamy; a Chinese father's practice of exposing his infants is out of the range of our practical politics; a suicidal Japanese would be judged a felon by English law; and the Christian Sunday is, here, still, a State holiday, for legislators and for subjects, who, on it, may neither buy nor sell freely. Evidently, the principle is the same, wheresoever be the drawing of the line. And Wordsworth and Southey were not fools nor madmen, nor mere religious bigots, when they set themselves against political rights for Catholics. They may, indeed, have been inopportune, and unable to feel the main current of public life. And they certainly were striving with the just decrees of Providence itself.

Like Southey's, was Scott's notion that he did not

believe either party care a bit for what is called Emancipation; only that the Catholics desire it, because the Protestants are not willing they should have it; and the Protestants desire to withhold it, because the want of it mortifies the Catholics.

However, this more genial, but more superficial, Walter Scott, gave in, long before his fellow Quarterly Reviewer's defeat, and held, that as the Catholics had received the franchise, it was vain to try to keep them from electing fellow Catholics. Though "his belief"—explained his son-in-law Lockhart (whose Catholic descendents are Scott's representatives at his Abbotsford to-day)—was,

that the best thing for Ireland would have been, never to relax the strictly *political* enactments of the penal laws, however harsh these might appear. Had they been kept in vigour for another half century it was Scott's "conviction that Popery would have been all but extinguished in Ireland."

Wordsworth's similar pious belief took him to the very limits of the earth: "It is, we trust, the intention of Providence that the Church of Rome should in due time disappear." He goes on: "In supporting a government resting upon a Protestant basis, we are working for the welfare of human kind, and supporting whatever there is of dignity in our frail nature."

Wordsworth had forgotten his revered Burke's scorn of what Burke dubbed the puerile notion, that if the Roman Catholic Church were destroyed, this English Establishment or any Protestant Church would continue to exist. And, truly, in their judgments revealed here, on the Church and the World, these poets, who followed Burke anent the Revolution, showed themselves little able to see who and what were on their side. For, theirs was the Christian instinctive judgment, on the so-called progress into commercial wealth, over against industrial slavery and pauperism; and on the worth of social traditions and pieties; and on the dignity of the life of the individual worker, a soul, not a "hand." The Catholic Church has been a check, to say the least, on a brutalizing Capitalism, which, even to-day, is less flourishing, wherever Catholic tradition has influence, or wherever Catholic principles are applied to industrial life—whether in Spain, or in the Rhineland. Every instinct of Catholicism is in favour of the life of the Tyrol, rather than that of the Black Country, and of the rural manufactory life under a Léon Harmel, rather than of the death-in-life of an Andrew Carnegie's Pittsburg. "England is the most anti-Catholic country in the world," said Cardinal Manning. Perhaps he was thinking, not least, of the attitude towards poverty—in English-speaking countries, generally, he might have added. A matter wherein the United States is more anti-Christian in tone than is England. It was Southey who described the sufferings of men, women, and children, in his country's machinery-progress a century since, as something more terrible than any other masses (of Western men, at least) had ever endured—a state of things incredible, impossible, under a regime where men, monkish and papal, had any say. It was Scott who wrote against the shallow and the foolish:

I am no great believer in the extreme degree of improvement to be derived from the advancement of science; for every study of that nature tends, when pushed to a certain extent, to harden the heart, and render the philosopher reckless of everything save the objects of his own pursuit; all equilibrium in the character is destroyed.

If Scott had but had the insight, of the contemporary *Broad Stone of Honour's* author, into what really was the spirit of the "monkery" and "popery" he saw as in a pageant!

You charge them [writes Kenelm Digby] with having pre-

vented men from attaining to that industry which distinguishes the moderns. True, the influence of the Church would operate so as to place limits to the cultivation of the commercial spirit—so as to prevent all that is sacred and holy from being sacrificed at the shrine of national wealth.

Still, to repeat, how much wiser and more Catholic-minded critics of life were these prejudiced Tory poets, with their sense of the weight of too much liberty, with their experience of flowers laughing in the path of duty, with their preaching of moral equality, and not mere equality in externals that matter not, with their belief in education by restraint and discipline, and their disbelief in moral progress by intellectual enlightenment; than were the preachers of what, in the Liberal Matthew Arnold's phrase, was "the narrow and shallow foolishness of vulgar modern liberalism," and its cure of the heart aches flesh is heir to by useful information, by amusements, by a gospel of comfort, and by that most detestable of all states of mind, as George Eliot's Positivism maintained—*knowingness*. Walter Scott's *anima naturaliter Catholica* spoke, to the effect, that in comparison of the education of the heart all the rest is rubbish. And on his death-bed, asking for only one book, the Gospels, and repeating the *Dies Irae*, he urged a younger man to "be a good man, for that is the only thing will bring you peace when you come to lie here."

Wordsworth and Southey, if they lost faith in revolution, and if they suspected democracy's future, never came to put the mere rich above the poor, protesting, as they ever were to the end, against the growing tyranny of commercialism, that present-day divider and destroyer of nations said to be at peace. These poets sought salvation, through men of light and leading, "who" (in Southey's own words) "have the fear of God before their eyes, and the love of their fellow-creatures in their hearts." But the Great Protestant Tradition had the good poet-souls themselves in thrall. *Secundum praescientiam et predestinationem; quam multae oves foris, tam multi lupi intus. Pereant errores; vivant homines.*

W. F. P. STOCKLEY.

THE PHILOSOPHER'S STONE

A SHORT time ago a mild sensation was caused in the newspaper world when it was announced that an eminent American Economist, speaking before a learned audience in London, stated that he "had been credibly informed that a German chemist has succeeded in the laboratory in making synthetic gold out of the baser metals." Pessimistic accounts were then given of the disastrous effects which would result from the inundation of the world's markets by this stream of manufactured gold. All the nations of the world, with the possible exception of Germany herself, might soon be faced with economic disaster. Many thoughtful readers may have been interested not merely in the question of the genuineness of this claim but in the very fact that such a claim should be seriously taken into consideration at a learned gathering. Not many years ago such an announcement would have been at once discounted as outside the bounds of scientific possibility. Have, then, scientific views changed on this point in recent years? Does the science of to-day look with any more favourable eye on the mediæval alchemist and his dreams of transmutation? In the following pages an attempt has been made to answer this question, and, by tracing out the theories of alchemy, to show that they are by no means so irrational as is oftentimes believed.¹

Two points must be noted by way of preface. The genuine mediæval alchemist was not merely a scientist: he was first and foremost a religious-minded man. He saw no antithesis between science and religion—for him indeed they were one and indivisible. Nature was one *because* God was one, and hence the unity of nature was the great *a priori* principle on which he based the whole edifice of science. On account of this unity he held that an analogy must exist between spiritual and material things and that similar laws must operate in each realm. Thus alchemy was, to a certain extent, an attempt to apply the principles of mysticism to things on the physical plane. One of the alchemists tells

¹ The reader may be referred to an article in this Review by B. Swindells, S.J. (September, 1914) where, under the title "Is 'Science' returning to 'Medievalism'?" this general question of the rehabilitation of pre-Reformation thought in science and philosophy is ably discussed.

us: ". . . the sages have been taught of God that this natural world is only an image and material copy of a heavenly and spiritual pattern, and that God has created it in imitation of the spiritual and invisible universe in order that men might be the better enabled to comprehend His heavenly teaching. Thus the sage sees heaven reflected in nature as in a mirror." This point of view naturally led, in the second place, to a scientific method which was in great part *a priori*. Their position was summed up in the saying: "What is above is as what is below and what is below is as what is above." Besides the analogy between the material and spiritual worlds this axiom signified that man is the world in miniature, that as the "microcosm" so is the "macrocosm," that to know oneself is to know all the world. The simplest road to knowledge of the external world is to be found in meditation and introspection. Their adhesion to this principle was so strong that it often led to a great neglect of corrective experiments.

Looking out on the world then, from his point of view the alchemist was immensely impressed by the profusion of life to be seen on all sides. God was Life itself. Man lived with a life which was a faint image of that of the Deity. Animals lived also, but with a form of life of a lower order than that enjoyed by man. Calling in his great principle of analogy the alchemist concluded that the so-called inorganic bodies must also be endowed with life—a very imperfect form of life, it is true, but still a real one. In the organic world the metals stand out as the noblest and yet simplest family of elements. They possess the most striking qualities: they are widespread over the earth: they are of inestimable value to men. So it came about that the alchemist attributed to them the highest form of life in the inorganic world. To them he applied his *a priori* principles in a very special manner.

When he considered the organic world in greater detail, the alchemist noted the universal law of growth and development amongst plants and animals. He saw all these spring from a simple seed and pass through many intermediate stages until at last the perfect state of each kind was attained. From this he generalized and deduced the great alchemical principle of universal development, viz., that every substance is endowed with resources and potentialities of improvement which develop spontaneously under suitable conditions.

Hence the inorganic is no more static than the organic world is. Inorganic matter is not eternal and unchanging, as appearances might lead one to believe: its state is rather one of flux, ever tending towards perfection. In particular the metals are continually developing from a primitive substance. "We see," writes Michael Sendigovius, "how nature without our help creates vegetable seed out of the four elements. But how about minerals? Nature brings forth mineral or metallic seed in the bowels of the earth." Throughout the ages this seed gradually grows and develops, forming first the baser metals. These, in their turn, develop into the nobler ones, until at last the most perfect metal of all is produced. When the alchemists attempted to fix the hierarchy of the metals they naturally conceded gold the place of honour, for it has always been acclaimed the Queen of Metals. Next in order they ranked silver; to lead they assigned the lowest place. Having assigned this order, it became a first principle to the alchemist that nature must form gold slowly in the earth—must in fact gradually transmute the inferior metals into gold, so that in a sense all other metals are gold in the making. As Ben Jonson puts it in his play, *The Alchemist*:

Metals would be gold if they had time.

The other metals known to us are therefore merely intermediate stages along a chain of perfection, whose final link is forged of purest gold.

But why you may ask, if all this be true, do we never see these changes or transmutations taking place in everyday life? Few of us have ever met the fortunate man who has gone to bed of a night with a shilling in his pocket and wakened in the morning to find in its place a golden sovereign. The alchemist is ready with his answer to this question. "It is not," he replies, "the fault of nature that such pleasant surprises do not take place more frequently: the fault is your own. It is only under suitable conditions and in the proper environment that growth will take place. If a man were to take a hen's egg and cast it into the sea you would have little sympathy with him when he complained that no chick was forthcoming. So also with your piece of silver. The proper environment of the metals is the bowels of the earth. There they grow and advance towards perfection; once removed thence all growth ceases. Place

your shilling within the earth and doubtless when your descendants in later ages go to seek it they will find it transmuted into the finest gold." Thomas Norton, in his *Ordinal of Alchemy*, says:

Metals of kinde grow lowe underground
For above erth rust in them is found;
Soe above erth appeareth corruption
Of metals and in long tyme destruction.
Whereof noe other cause is found in this case
But that above Erth thei be not in thar place
Contrarie places to nature causeth strife
As fishes out of water losen their Lyfe;
And Man with beasts and birds live in ayer
But stones and Mineralls under Erth repaier.

So strong was the common belief in this theory that records exist of mines having been closed for a number of years in order to permit new quantities of metal to form again in them.

A few quotations from writers of alchemical times may serve to explain their position more clearly. One such writes: "What prerogative have vegetables over metals that God should give them seed and withhold it from the other. Are not metals as much in His sight as trees?" Again we read:

No egg but differs from a chicken more
Than metals in themselves . . .

and again:

Besides who doth not see in daily practice
Art can beget bees, hornets, beetles, wasps
Out of the carcases and dung of creatures
Yea, scorpions of an herb being rightly placed?
And these are living creatures far more perfect
And excellent than metals

—*a priori* arguments all of them, you will observe, but sufficiently strong in the eyes of the alchemist to act as a solid foundation for his scientific system.

Such then being the theoretical basis of the doctrine of the transmutation of metals, how was the alchemist to put this theory to the test? For light on this point he turned once again to the method of analogy. He noted that nature frequently requires long periods of time to complete her cycle of changes—centuries for example are required for the acorn to develop into the full-grown oak, and Sendigovius tells us that it takes the elephant one thousand years to reach

his full perfection. Long ages also must be required in the case of the metals. In *The Alchemist*, Subtle, who acts the title role of the play, says:

..... 'twere absurd
To think that nature in the earth bred gold
Perfect in the instant . . .
Nature doth first beget the imperfect then
Proceeds she to the perfect.

As the changes took place only by such slow degrees, it is evident that if the theory is to be verified it would be useless to wait for nature herself to carry out the changes unaided. Centuries would be required to decide the question if this method were pursued. Turning therefore again to the organic world for guidance, the alchemist found it a matter of common knowledge that plants are improved and brought quickly to maturity by appropriate culture, by digging and enriching the soil, and by a judicious selection of seed. Animals also are improved by careful breeding. Could not analogous means, he asked himself, be applied in the case of the metals? In attempting to solve this question arose the search for the philosopher's stone whose property it was to speed up the leisurely ways of nature. In this the alchemists sought after nothing preternatural—their aim never was the creation of gold. They only sought a means of assisting nature in that gradual transmutation which she is continually carrying out in accordance with her ordinary laws. Philalethes the alchemist says "lead has in many cases developed in the bowels of the earth, and we contend that the same effect is produced in a much shorter time by means of our art." Another alchemist writes: "The art of alchemy does not create metals or even develop them out of their metallic first substance; it only takes up the unfinished handicraft of nature and completes it. Nature has only left a comparatively small thing for the artist to do—the completion of that which she has already begun."

Before following the alchemist in his search after the philosopher's stone, we must pause for a moment to consider the metaphysical views prevalent in the early days of alchemy—views which seem to have been in great part based on the philosophy of Plato. According to their system man, the most perfect organic being, was made up of the union of three parts, viz., body, soul and spirit. The body was the outward manifestation of man—that part of him which reveals itself

to our senses; the soul is the inward individual principle which marks off this particular man as different from all others; the spirit is that universal soul in which all men were supposed to participate. Analogically, therefore, all inorganic substances have a body, revealing itself in outward forms and properties; a soul which distinguishes it from all other parts of inorganic matter; spirit or that all-pervading essence of things which is common to all forms of inorganic matter. It is this latter principle which is of importance in alchemical theory. It alone was looked upon as one and unchangeable: all things else but it are slowly growing, developing and approaching perfection. To the greater or less amount of this universal spirit in any substance is due whatever degree of perfection the substance possesses. Could this essence be obtained in the pure state and applied to one of the baser metals, at once that metal would be raised in the scale of perfection—transmuted into silver or gold. Dissolved and taken in liquid form, it would renew the physiological youth of man, though not render him free from death as some historians of alchemy have inaccurately declared. Wherever it was applied in the realm of nature it would bring with it renewal and perfection. Hence it was spoken of under various names; as the transmuter of metals it was called the Philosopher's Stone; as the renovator of youth it was known as the Elixir of Life; under other aspects it was referred to as the Flower of the Flowers, the Red Lion, the White Eagle, the Sun of Perfection, the Everlasting Remedy, and so on. Subtle, in *The Alchemist*, tells us:

..... and all these named
Intending but one thing.

From the mystical point of view it typified Christ our Lord, the Saviour of Mankind.

In seeking for this stone the first point to decide on is obviously the materials to be used in the search. Here at the very beginning the alchemists seem to have differed greatly amongst themselves. One school argued more or less after this fashion. Since this wonderful essence contains the properties of all things in a refined and attenuated state we must gather together as many different objects as possible so as to include in our mixture all possible perfections. Then we must endeavour to retain these properties while driving away the grosser parts of the things themselves.

Hence arose a strange medley of ingredients. Surley, in *The Alchemist*, gives us a partial list:

..... materials

Of lye and egg shells; man's blood

Hair of the head, burnt clouts, chalk, merds and clay.

Powder of bones, scaldings of iron, glass

And worlds of other strange ingredients

Would burst a man to name.

The other school ridiculed this whole method—they considered so many ingredients as both superfluous and useless. They argued that as the final product was of a mineral nature it was in the mineral kingdom alone that the ingredients should be sought. In this kingdom it is gold and silver that possess this stone in greatest abundance and in the purest state. Hence these two metals and their salts must evidently be the starting point in the search.

Once the ingredients were selected there was more agreement as to the first stages of the process to be followed—all consented that the first step was to permit putrefaction to set in. Paracelsus tells us: "Destruction perfects that which is good, for the good cannot appear on account of that which conceals it." Things thus mortified by man's devices he considers not to be really dead, and gives the following rather quaint illustration of his meaning: "You see this to be the case with lions, which are all born dead and are first vitalized by the horrible noise of their parents, just as a sleeping person is wakened by a shout." And Basil Valentine writes: "Grain and all vegetable seed when cast into the ground must decay before it can spring up again; moreover putrefaction imparts life to many worms and other animalculae. . . . If bread be placed in honey and suffered to decay ants are generated; maggots are also generated by the decay of nuts, apples and pears. Know that in like manner no metallic seed can develop or multiply unless it be reduced to a perfect putrefaction."

So far we have been considering the methods and theories of alchemy. The important question now arises: what has modern science got to say regarding the possibility of such transmutations? Is it friendly or hostile towards them? If we consult the nineteenth-century scientist we find that he will not admit for a moment such a possibility. Muir, for example, in his *History of Alchemy*, writes: "Such a change as that of lead into silver is unthinkable." It seemed in-

deed in those days to be fully established that each of the so-called elements was one and indivisible, rigidly divided off and essentially differing in nature from all others. Hence the passage from one to another seemed an impossible one—an unbridgeable and unbridgeable chasm existed between them. The discovery of radium, however, in 1896, completely revolutionized atomic theory. Here we found one element transmuting into another and that not by artificial means but in the ordinary course of nature. Since then many other elements have been discovered which are continually disintegrating and passing into simpler forms. Hence the modern theory is that all the different atoms known to us are built up of the same material and only differ one from another in their style of architecture. It is only just two years ago since Sir Ernest Rutherford went one step further and announced that by artificial means he had at last succeeded in breaking up atoms of nitrogen into atoms of helium and of another so far unrecognized gas—the first claim to artificial transmutation that has been made since the times of the alchemists.¹ It is true that the methods used to-day could not possibly have been known to the alchemists or even have been accidentally used by them—the quantities of gold which they claim to have transmuted could never have been produced by the methods of to-day. Still, if there be one method of transmutation there may be others also, and these possibly may have been known to some of the alchemists. That they are unknown to present-day science in no way proves their non-existence. Hoeffler, in his *History of Chemistry*, very sanely remarks:

To jeer at the alchemical theory is to commit an anachronism and an injustice. Unless the world should come to an end tomorrow no one can have the pretension to suppose that our contemporaries have said the last word on science and that nothing will remain for our descendants to discover, no errors for them to correct, no theories for them to set right.

What evidence is there that such transformations ever took

¹ "The prospects of the successful accomplishment of artificial transmutation brighten almost daily. The ancients seem to have had something more than an inkling that the accomplishment of transmutation would confer upon men powers hitherto the prerogative of the gods. But now we know definitely that the material aspect of transmutation would be of small importance in comparison with the control over the inexhaustible stores of internal atomic energy to which its successful accomplishment would inevitably lead." Professor Soddy in *Nature*, Nov. 6, 1919.

place? In attempting to answer this question we must at once set aside by far the greater number of cases adduced by alchemical writers. In all of these we find on examination that salts of gold or silver were introduced either knowingly or unknowingly at some stage of the process, and hence, of course, the presence of the metal in the final product is easily explained. When, however, these cases have been set aside there does really seem to remain a body of testimony on the part of trusty and eminent men which it is very difficult to disregard. Two such cases may be cited at some length.

John Baptist Van Helmont, a man celebrated alike for his skill as a physician and chemist and for his nobility of character, testifies in more than one place that he had himself carried out the transmutation of quicksilver into gold. The composition of the stone used in these cases was unknown to him. He writes:

There was once given to me one fourth-part of one grain of this stone; I call a grain the six hundredth part of an ounce; this quarter of one grain therefore being rolled up in paper I projected upon eight ounces of quicksilver made hot in a crucible; straightway all the quicksilver with a certain degree of noise stood still from flowing and settled into a yellow lump; but after pouring it out, the bellows blowing, there were found eight ounces less eleven grains of the purest gold; therefore one only grain of that powder had transmuted 19.156 parts of quicksilver into the best gold.

In another place he writes:

I have at distinct times made projection with my hand of one grain of the powder upon some thousand grains of quicksilver and the business succeeded in the fire as the books do promise.

Even more circumstantial is the following account given by Helvetius, one of the most eminent doctors of his day and physician to the Prince of Orange:

On a certain day [he writes] there came to my house a man who was a complete stranger to me. After we had exchanged salutations he stated that he wished to say something to me about the pyrotechnic art as he had read one of my tracts in which I hinted a suspicion whether the Grand Arcanum of the Sages was not after all a gigantic hoax. . . . After some conversation he thus addressed me, "Since you have read so much

in the books of the alchemists regarding this stone may I be allowed the question whether you have not yourself prepared it." On my answering in the negative he took out of his bag a cunningly worked ivory box in which there were three large pieces of a substance resembling glass or pale sulphur and informed me that here was enough of the tincture for the production of twenty tons of gold. When I had held the precious treasure in my hands for quarter of an hour (during which time I listened to a recital of its wonderful curative properties) I was compelled to restore it to its owner. My request that he would give me a piece of his stone he somewhat brusquely refused, adding in a milder tone that he could not give it to me for all the wealth I possessed and that not on account of its preciousness but for some other reason which it was not lawful for him to divulge. When my strange visitor had concluded his narrative I besought him to give me a proof of his assertion by performing the transmutatory operation on some metal in my presence. He answered evasively that he could not do so then but that he would return in three weeks, and that, if he was then at liberty to do so, he would show me something that would make me open my eyes. He appeared punctually at the appointed day. . . . I asked him point blank to show me the transmutation of metals. . . . I reminded him of his promise. He retorted that his promise had been conditional. . . . At last however I prevailed upon him to give me a piece of his precious stone—a piece no larger than a grain of rape seed. Upon my uttering a doubt whether it would be sufficient to tinge four grains of lead, he eagerly demanded it back. I complied in the hope that he would exchange it for a larger bit; instead of which he divided it into two parts with his thumb, threw one half away and gave me the other saying, "even now it is sufficient for you." . . . He bade me take half an ounce of lead and melt it in a crucible. I answered however that my chief difficulty was about the application of the tincture. I confessed that when I had held his ivory box in my hand I had managed to extract a few crumbs of his stone but that they had changed my lead not into gold but into glass. He laughed and said I was more expert at theft than in the application of this stone. "You should have protected your spoil with wax and then it would have been able to penetrate the lead and transmute it into gold." With a promise to return at nine o'clock next morning he left me. But at the stated hour next day he did not make his appearance; the afternoon came and I waited for him until half-past seven o'clock. Thereupon my wife came and tempted me to try the transmutation myself. I determined however to wait until the morrow and in the meantime ordered my son to light the fire as I was now almost sure he was an impostor. On the

morrow I asked my wife to put the tincture in wax and I myself in the meantime prepared six drachms of lead, I then cast the tincture enveloped as it was in on the lead; as soon as it was melted there was a hissing sound and a slight effervescence and after quarter of an hour I found that the whole mass had been turned into gold. . . . We immediately took it to the goldsmith who at once declared it to be the finest gold and offered to pay fifty florins an ounce for it. The rumour of course spread at once through the city and in the afternoon I had visits from many illustrious students of this art; I also received a call from the Master of the Mint and some other gentlemen who requested me to place at their disposal a small piece of the gold in order that they might subject it to the usual tests. I consented and we went to the house of a small silversmith who submitted a small piece of my gold to the test; three or four parts of silver are melted in the crucible with one part of gold and then beaten out into thin plates upon which some nitric acid is poured. The usual result is that the silver is dissolved while the gold sinks to the bottom in the shape of a black powder and after the nitric acid is poured off, the gold melted once again in a crucible resumes its former shape. When we now performed this experiment we thought at first that half the gold had evaporated; but afterwards we found that this was not the case. Then we tried another test, viz., that which is performed by means of the septuple of antimony; at first it seemed as if eight grains of gold had been lost but afterwards we found not only had two scruples of the silver been converted into gold but the silver itself had been greatly improved both as regards quality and malleability. Thus I have unfolded the whole story from beginning to end.

As a piece of historical evidence this seems very strong, and in face of such testimony it is not easy to defend those who dogmatically declare that alchemy was from beginning to end either ignorance or deception. After reviewing the case for both sides it seems most reasonable to take up just at present an agnostic position with reference to the whole question. More evidence may be produced in the future to enable us to form a more decided judgment.

C. J. POWER.

THE ELIZABETHAN ACT THAT MADE MARTYRS

IN pursuance of our object to show that the purpose of the Act under which most of the English Martyrs suffered was essentially anti-Catholic,¹ having for motive the extirpation of the Catholic priesthood, we proceed to an examination of its text, defence, working and results, with a preliminary description of the political atmosphere that made its barbarity possible. A useful and suggestive book has lately appeared entitled *Tudor Ideals*, by Mr. Lewis Einstein. It is an endeavour to group together and to reduce to system the principles in government and in daily life, which give the Tudor period its very distinctive character. If the book is not quite all that we require, this is because Mr. Einstein is reluctant to treat fully of Tudor ideals in religion, and absolves himself from considering many problems which we cannot possibly avoid.

We start, however, exactly as he does, by recognizing that the whole Tudor scheme originated in their rule being based on usurpation. It rested not on constitutional right but on force of arms. Kings in the past had been stark and violent often enough, but never before so persistently autocratic and tyrannical, even in the realm of law. The idea grows up that the realm is the personal property of the King and the inhabitants his serfs. One cannot go away from the country and return when one likes, for the monarch can forbid one under pain of treason from leaving, or when one has left, prohibit his return under the same savage penalties. He can make "treasons" without limit, and Elizabeth's Act (23 Eliz. i.) to "restrain subjects in due obedience," means in plain English to "compel them to submit to her Spiritual Supremacy." We shall see numerous other developments of this ideal.

The Tudor tyranny was especially perturbed by the threat of excommunication and the danger of assassination. Excommunication with deposition had been the recognized punishment for excessive tyranny in the Middle Ages, and was enjoined by the disciplinary decrees of the Council of Lateran in 1215. Pope St. Pius V., despite the enormous changes

¹ See "Why did our Martyrs suffer?" *THE MONTH*, Jan. 1922, pp. 43 sqq.

since the thirteenth century, had issued a sentence of excommunication and deposition (1570), believing, in error, that the favourable moment had come. His belief was quite illusory, and his Bull a dead letter;¹ but of course it irritated the Tudor court beyond measure. It was their theory that the Crown had absorbed the functions of the Popes, instead of which the Pope here sentenced the Queen of England to extinction! Ever after this the English authorities called the Pope their capital enemy, any intercourse with whom was treasonable.

In the fate of the Prince of Orange in 1584, Elizabeth and her ministers were more or less sure to see the threat of assassination; we can hardly wonder at it. And assassination was the more terrifying because they did not recognize any constitutional successor. Elizabeth, partly because of her repeated matrimonial disappointments, partly out of whim, had eventually decided on having no acknowledged successor. So the country looked uneasily forward to an interregnum, which was no part of the English constitution, and was convinced that anarchy would ensue.²

But the remedy decided on by Elizabeth's Parliament was not to settle the succession, but to make all safe for Protestantism. Mary Stuart was the nearest legitimate heir, but the Parliament in Elizabeth's twenty-seventh year, provided in effect that, in case of the Queen's murder, a committee of Protestant peers should come into power, should execute Mary, and afterwards, one infers, settle the succession. This was styled *The Act for the Queen's Safety*.

These few words on contemporary ideals will serve to orient our minds, while judging the barbarous legislation now before us. If we neglect the ideals of the age we shall be inevitably drawn to imagine that the sole motive of the legislators must have been a simply diabolic cruelty. But this would not at all square with our knowledge of this generation drawn from other sources. In many ways they were a generous and brave race, up to the level of their contemporaries in civilization, humanity, and the power of self-government: compared with the present generation, of course much less mature and far more impressionable. This made them, when swayed by sectarian fanaticism and Tudor

¹ This was in effect recognized by the answer given by Gregory XIII. to Persons and Campion in 1580, *English Catholics in the Reign of Elizabeth*, p. 290.

² R.O., *Domestic, Elizabeth* clxxvi. 26; used by Froude xi., 537, 539.

ideals, harsh and rigorous to excess, though their natures were not inhuman.

Only one more preliminary is required. The law of 27 Elizabeth, though bearing without discrimination on all priests, was commonly called "The Jesuits' Bill." Why was that? This use of language, like the rest of the agitation, was an importation from Holland after the assassination of the Prince of Orange, as has already been explained. Mr. Froude, with fine sympathy for the zealots, writes truly enough: "The terror of the situation centred in the word 'Jesuit.'" The reality of this scare is clear enough in the few papers which survive, but its hollowness may well be conjectured from the number of Jesuits in the country. While the agitation was being got up—not one; one only, when the law was passed, viz., pious old Father William Weston, formerly of Christ Church, Oxford. The fanatic party had got the name Jesuit on the brain, and applied it to any conscientious Catholic.¹ "Jesuit Bill" meant nothing more than Bill against conscientious priests.

Having previously brought our story down to the election of the new Parliament, we may now follow the course of our Bill through the two Houses.² It was introduced presumably on December 14, 1584, and was in law-books styled "A Bill for the utter extirpation of Popery, against Jesuits and others." It was after this engrossed together with the Bill for the Queen's safety on the 16th, and sent to the Lords after a third reading on the 17th. The Lords gave it a first reading after the Christmas holidays, on February 6th. It was read again on the 17th, and once more, with amendments and a proviso, on March 1st, and a third time (*sic*), with all amendments, on the 3rd, and returned to the Commons. Meantime the Commons had re-cast their Bill for the Queen's safety, and requested the Lords to confer with them on the Bill against the Jesuits. For this purpose they appointed a new committee, consisting of the Privy Councillors in that House, and this committee, with the Lords committee, "perfected and passed" the Bill on March

¹ This is seen in Thomas Bilson's (afterwards Bishop of Winchester) *Christian Subjection and Unchristian Rebellion*, 1585. Though reputed the most moderate of Anglican controversialists, he habitually, in this book, uses "Jesuit" as a synonym for "conscientious Catholic."

² *The Lords' Journal*, II, pp. 78—95, covers the period, but *The Journal of the Commons* is lost. D'Ewes' *Journals of all the Parliaments of Q. Elizabeth*, pp. 340, 370 has, however, preserved all the essential dates.

19th. Royal assent followed on the 29th. We know nothing of what was said in either House. An anonymous paper attests the fanaticism into which the members had been worked.¹ They profess a blind belief that the country is in the hands of murderous Jesuits who only await an opportunity to murder the Queen. The full text of the Act, in the ancient spelling, will be found in *Statutes of the Realm*:²

27 Elizabeth, cap. ii. AN ACT AGAINST JESUITS, SEMINARY PRIESTS, AND SUCH OTHER LIKE DISOBEDIENT PERSONS.

WHEREAS divers Persons called or professed Jesuits, Seminary Priests, and other Priests,³ which have been and from time to time are made in the Parts beyond the Seas, by or according to the Order and Rites of the Romish Church, HAVE OF LATE COME⁴ and been sent, and daily do come and are sent, into this Realm of England, and other the Queen's Majesty's Dominions OF PURPOSE (as it hath appeared, as well by sundry of their own Examinations and Confessions, as by divers other manifest means and proofs) not only to withdraw her Highness Subjects from their due Obedience⁵ to her Majesty, but also to stir up and move Sedition,⁶ Rebellion and open Hostility within the same

¹ R.O., *Domestic, Elizabeth* clxxvi, n. 26. The *exalté* letter of W. Herlle, 22 July 1584, *Calendar S.P. Foreign, Holland*, is often cited in this connection.

² *Statutes of the Realm*, 1819, iv. 705. The preamble is here printed in full, the subsequent sections with gradually increasing abbreviations. Spelling is modernized and variations of type are introduced for facility of reading. Comments on the terms of the act are given in footnotes. An examination of the Parliament Rolls might show erasures and insertions, but the actual text is abundantly sufficient for our purposes.

³ "Jesuits, Seminary Priests, and other Priests."—This grouping, with slight variations for the third member, recurs throughout the act in all 12 times; Jesuits are never mentioned without Priests, nor Priests without Jesuits. It is priesthood which is attacked in all cases. There is to be no excuse for Seminary priests, on the score of their not being Jesuits. In § iii "Deacons religious and ecclesiastical persons" are included, but no actual proceedings appear to have been ever taken against them.

⁴ "Have of late come into this realm." In this offence we see the Tudor idea of the realm being the private property of the Crown.

⁵ "Of purpose, as has appeared by their confessions, to withdraw subjects from due obedience."—This sonorous charge, is really an encomium, if one remembers that "due obedience" has been defined by act of parliament (23 Elizabeth, i), where the preamble explained that this meant obedience "in religion established," that is in Anglicanism. So the supposed enormity was simply preaching the faith.

⁶ "But also to stir up sedition." Here the words of the Act lie flatly. There are no confessions of any priest, of having attempted to "move sedition and rebellion." Possibly the framers of the law may have had in mind the confessions of Throckmorton. But even if they were above suspicion, it would be altogether false to say that they were the confessions of priests. But the

her Highness Realms and Dominions, TO THE GREAT DANGERING of the Safety of her most Royal Person,¹ and to the utter Ruin, Desolation and Overthrow of the whole Realm, if the same be not the sooner by some good Means foreseen and prevented.

i, FOR REFORMATION WHEREOF BE IT ORDAINED . . . that all and every Jesuits, Seminary Priests, and other Priests made and ordained out of the Realm . . . , or within any of her Majesty's Realms or dominions by any authority . . . derived challenged or pretended from the See of Rome &c. shall depart, &c., &c. within forty days, &c. under pain of High Treason. ii, That ALL JESUITS AND SEMINARY PRIESTS ENTERING THE REALM are guilty of High Treason. iii, Their RECEIVERS are guilty of felony. iv, STUDENTS in seminaries to return and take Oath of Supremacy. v, NO ONE shall send them money. vi, MASTERS OF SHIPS may take them into exile. vii, viii, ix, x, xi, xii, provisions for taking the Oath of Supremacy, for invalids, penalties for not informing, and administrative details.

Looking to the character of the Act as a whole we notice that it is entirely *vindictive*. It alleges that some unnamed persons have offended; it decrees the punishment, not of the alleged culprits, but of a different class of men, that is to say, priests, against whom no offence has been proved.

A punishment, more savage than can nowadays be put down on paper, was thus without reason decreed against priests if they went through a purely spiritual act, that is, if they received the sacred order of priesthood, according to the only available rite which recognized that sacrament, the rite of Rome. We remember that during the late war this sort of procedure was called "frightfulness," and certainly the Tudor frightfulness was far more barbarous and unreasonable than that of the Prussian.

But let us hear the defenders of the Act, who of course take a view very different from ours. We have said that nothing survives of the official arguments in its favour. The nearest approach to official arguments would seem to occur in the rather ample account which we have of the impeach-

probability is that the legislators were going still further, and assuming the position of their scribe, Anthony Munday, in his *Watchword to beware of traitors*, 1584. In this he enumerates all our Martyrs in the same line with the most desperate political adventurers. More, Fisher, and Campion rank exactly with Wat Tyler and Jack Cade, with Stukely and Fitzgerald. Only in this false supposition were the confessions of political adventurers equivalent to those of priests.

¹ It is also altogether false to allege that Elizabeth's person had ever been in danger from priests.

ment of the Martyrs of Chichester.¹ The speaker was Thomas Bowyer, an otherwise unknown lawyer, and the following summary keeps as closely as possible to his words:

The prisoners at the bar, he said, "were far deceived to think they were in question for any matter of religion. They have no cause to find fault with the law or to allege any cruelty therein." It was not the new law that made them traitors, but the old common law of England, as formulated in 25 Edward III., which made it a capital offence to adhere to the Queen's enemies, or to compass her deprivation, to seek her life: and this no doubt had been their intention.

It was his office at present to prove this by some overt act of theirs. And here the new law came in, defining that ordination was such a proof.

"For no man will doubt that the Pope is the queen's capital enemy, as one that goeth about by his sentence to deprive her of her estate. But every priest, being a natural born subject, going out of the realm, has adhered to the Pope, and having by his authority taken the order of priesthood, has returned to win the Queen's subjects to their faction. Such men must therefore even by the common law be adjudged traitors."

So Bowyer, and doubtless if Tudor ideals had been Gospel truths, he would have spoken well. But in reality it was not true that the Pope was the capital enemy. On the contrary, his excommunication was an act of paternal correction. It was in defence of liberty of consciences, which Elizabeth was most gravely oppressing by her enforced changes in belief. Secondly, even if the Pope had been moved by hostility, it was mere sophistry to say that priesthood involved siding with the Pope in such hostility. Ordination is rather a pledge to keep peace, to be the friend to all. Lastly, it was most untrue to say that the returning priest came to win subjects "to their faction." His object was merely religious and involved no threat, except to irreligion.

If the Pope was not an enemy, then the antecedents from which Bowyer argued fall of themselves. There was no transgression of the law of Edward III. and there was religious persecution. The theory that a law could define ordination as an overt act of treason, was but a return to the Tudor ideal of "making" an innocent action to be treason-

¹ R.O., *Dom. Eliz.* ccxvii. 1, printed by Rd. Simpson, *Rambler*, April, 1857. N.S. vii. p. 279. The essential parts are quoted in *Lives of the Martyrs*, Ser. II. i. p. 478, &c. The trial was on Sept. 30, 1588.

able. The idea only illustrates the extreme of autocracy to which the Tudor courts were ready to go.

Moreover, facts, which are much stronger than words, gave the case in which Bowyer was engaged a complexion quite different to that which he was so adroitly suggesting.

There were in all four priests prisoners, all of whom had at first confessed their faith bravely. But after sentence John Owen's courage failed. He openly renounced his faith, took at once the oath of supremacy, and next day (Tuesday) made four sweeping statements repudiating the Pope's power in the politico-religious sphere. He was then at once taken into the household of the Protestant bishop. That same Tuesday the other three priests were drawn out to execution. Ralph Crockett and Edward James suffered martyrdom. But Francis Edwards, just before the rope was put round his neck, wavered, "became conformable, and acknowledged the Queen's authority." He also openly took the oath of supremacy, and our story leaves him under the instructions of a Protestant parson.

What do these changes of mind and fortune mean, except that it was the Catholic faith itself which was the real offence? Once that is renounced all talk of treason and danger is ended, and capital punishment changes to rewards and confidence. If it be said that this confidence came by their entire renunciation of the Pope's power in temporals, the answer is obvious that the first test exacted was the oath of supremacy in the sphere of spirituals. Nor did even that suffice; these backsliders did not give full satisfaction until, like true Vicars of Bray, they had shown themselves ready to be taught any change of creed that might be required.

The crime of priests consisted of two elements. Of the first, ordination, we have already spoken. The second element was their return to England. According to Tudor ideals the crown could banish whom it would for any colourable reason and make their return treason. But in this case the banishment was altogether antagonistic to the command of Christ to His Apostles: "Go, teach all nations" (Matt. xxviii. 19). The prohibition, even of purely missionary visits, was evidently intended to destroy the ancient Church altogether. This object is again shown in the death penalty for harbouring a priest, and in other punishments of the severest kind against the youthful seminarist, and the man who fails to inform against a hidden priest of whom he hap-

pens to have information. Under the Stuarts, when liberty was beginning to assert itself again, several of our martyrs, especially Almond, Bullaker, Morgan, and Newport spoke strongly in court against this charge.

When we look at the Act in practice its malice is not toned down. Of the 227 martyrs who were still to suffer, about 181 died under this Act, including 147 priests. For their trials we have about seventeen original indictments of martyrs.¹ But Dr. Smith, Bishop of Chalcedon, in his catalogue of martyrs, dated 1628, had inquiries made in London and York, and he certifies that 81 indictments, or entries of condemnation, were then found on the Assize rolls, nearly all of which rolls have since perished. There is superabundant evidence, therefore, as to the actual charge for which the martyrs suffered.

From our Catholic accounts it seems as if the witnesses of the trials were sometimes puzzled by the legal formalities, and were unable to tell where the indictment ended. But this is easy to understand because indictments were written and read in Latin, which would not have been easy to follow. Then they were explained in English by the crown advocates, who were in the habit of importing all sorts of other charges and insinuations into the case.² An untrained witness was most likely to think that these side issues really belonged to the main charge. So far as our records go the indictments themselves were identical in substance, and varied in small details only. There is never more than one count. Where our witnesses speak of several "charges" (they do this, for instance, in the case of Almond), they should be understood as using non-legal language, to describe the prosecutor's zeal in accumulating points which would appeal to the jury, and save them from the unwelcome task of dwelling exclusively on the spiritual charges of which the martyrs were accused.

This same reluctance is further illustrated by the "Bloody Question," and similar devices for mitigating the popular disapproval of martyrdoms. The "Bloody Question" generally turned upon the Pope's Temporal power. An hypothesis

¹ Except that of Pybush (R.O., Coram Rege, 146, m. 2., 37 Eliz. Trin.) all the other indictments are in the *Middlesex County Records*, Ed. Cordy Jeaffreson, 1886, &c. There are also imperfect records of an even larger number.

² See for instance the trial of Philip Howard, Earl of Arundel, C.R.S., Vol. XXI. p. 232. It is reported in greater detail than is the case with others.

would be started,—“Suppose a Papal army came for no other purpose than to restore Catholicism, would you fight against it?” The Catholic on trial would probably endeavour to avoid saying that he would fight against it, and this would at once give cause for the cry that he sided with the Queen’s enemies, and then the sentence of 27 Elizabeth took effect, whereas if he had shown great zest at the idea of fighting the Pope he might have been reprieved.

But such procedure does not really alter the cause of death. There was no law to enforce any answer to the “Bloody Question.” A Catholic incurred no new penalty for showing unwillingness to volunteer against the Pope. But it turned public opinion against the martyr and made men easily condone his execution. It was much the same with the Oath of Allegiance, which the Pope had forbidden because of the anti-Catholic phrases in the formulary. Some people took it because, with the usual excessive consideration for royalty of that day, they overlooked all qualifications in proclaiming their loyalty. Under James I. one might perhaps always have escaped the death penalty if one would have taken that oath. But if a priest refused to do so, the cause of his death was still the same as when he was sentenced. The same thing is true of those who returned to England after having been banished. If caught, they were pretty sure to be indicted and executed as priests, but the cause of death was still the same. If they originally came with a good motive, their return was equally praiseworthy.¹

In conclusion, something must be said of the actual proceedings in court in the trials under this Act. In effect, everything turned on proving the prisoner to be a priest. At first, strange though it seems to us, this was confessed by priests almost as a matter of course. This was because of the submissive habit prevalent in Tudor times. Tudor absolutism had started in Catholic times, and deference was the converse of the Tudor claim to absolutism. After 20 or 30 years, however, the priests had learned a lesson. Though magistrates and examiners insist, priests declare that

¹ Ven. Richard Newport was thrice captured and twice banished, but the indictment on which he was executed, under 27 Elizabeth, simply charges him with being a priest at his last return to England.—Guildhall, *Assize Rolls*, 28th May, 1612, not in Cordy Jeaffreson’s edition. In the lately issued *Life of Thomas Earl of Arundel*, however, by Miss Hervey, she, following the ordinary parlance of the day, says that Newport was executed for returning after banishment.

they are not bound to incriminate themselves. What made their duty clear in this matter was that, if they did confess, they might do grievous injury to their former hosts. We have one instance in 1654 of the judge endeavouring to stop Ven. John Southworth, who under his circumstances thought well to confess himself a priest. Alas, that this should only have happened once!

The history of this Act does not stop with the trials held under its auspices. Its injurious effects were felt on every side. On the Catholics it brought the heaviest of losses, that of the best lives, which it took away with an appalling facility. It also reacted on the persecutors. Crown and Parliament seemed hereby to pledge their credit that every cruelty, every insult, every injustice, was warranted against the Catholic priest, and the simple people soon learned its lesson; bloodshed begot bloodlust; crowds gloated over the butchery, and the corruption sank ever deeper into the public mind. Though inoperative after 1681, Protestant opinion would not easily allow it to be removed from the Statute Book. This did not take place till 1844 by the Roman Catholic Bill of 7 and 8 Victoria.

J. H. POLLEN.

THE TWO BROTHERS

V.

"**H**I, Fräulein, where is the landlord?" demanded the medical student with a sharp impatience, very little approved by Elsa.

"He has gone to the cellar."

The young man certainly swore, and Elsa was certainly not wrong in disapproving that exercise. Her silence became almost audible.

"Is there no brandy *here*?" demanded the youth of strong language.

"Won't wine do?"

"No it won't."

The medical student had not reached the door of the room at the end of the passage before Hermann's eyes opened, slowly indeed and heavily. They rested, very indifferently, on the back of the hastily retreating and impatient student. But though they stared dully they remained open. He even raised his head just enough to let him see the whole room. He sought for his brother, but there was no sign of him: he must have gone out of the open door into the garden. He was displeased with his brother for leaving him. He believed he had had a fit, and his brother ought not to have left him. Perhaps he had not. Perhaps he had only gone to get help. Anyway it was very cold, and his legs felt numb lying there on the chill brick floor. Why need he?

As he scrambled up he found he was bleeding: surely Heinrich had not stabbed him? He felt absolutely certain Heinrich would not. He knew he had gone on sneering at him till he had driven him beside himself with passion, and he could well imagine his brother being carried away so far as to deal him a hasty blow—though he had no recollection whatever of it: but he knew Heinrich too well to conceive it possible he should have stabbed his brother. Only why should he be bleeding? The blood could come from no large wound, it only trickled, oozed rather: he first became aware of it when he stood up, and a handkerchief, that certainly was not his own, dropped on the floor: it was plentifully stained with blood—and dirty besides. He knew it was no more Heinrich's than his own: Heinrich was as fastidiously clean as he was. It was a very coarse handker-

chief and looked as if it had been used for a fortnight. It must belong to the man he had seen hurrying from the room, who had been alone with him while he was unconscious. Had this man done anything to him?

The dirty handkerchief disgusted him—he would throw it out into the garden. Meanwhile he remembered that in his pocket was a travelling-flask, full of brandy. He was so cold that he was glad he had remembered it. He would drink some of the brandy immediately: he did so and went to throw the handkerchief out of the open half-door down into the garden. Nearly sixty yards away, on the ground in the alley, he saw what looked like another handkerchief, but gleaming whitely: it was just such an one as Heinrich used and it might possibly be his. The alley was not paved but was of earth "stoggy" and moist: there were certainly footsteps there, one person's, and he would go and examine them. Yes, they were just such as his own feet or his brother's might make—such as his own feet did now make beside them. It *was* Heinrich's handkerchief, marked in one corner H. v. G. with the little coronet of nobility over the letters. He picked it up and hurried on towards the gate in the wall, for his brother's footsteps continued and showed he had gone thither. They were those of a walker who had been *running*. "Why," Hermann asked, "was he running? If he had been hastening to get help he would have hurried into the house, not away from it."

VI.

After Heinrich had run a little way, eastwards, over the grass of the old archery-ground, the curve of the path brought him in sight of the many buildings of the abbey, and it brought him in sight of two trees—two special trees much taller and more important than any others thereabouts. They were certainly fifty feet high, slender, and shapely: of precisely the same age and height. They were called The Two Brothers.

Walking towards, with his hands behind his back, and his back towards Heinrich, was a monk, bareheaded, but with the hood of his cowl drawn forward over the crown of his head. He was not less than two hundred yards in front of Heinrich. He was saying a rosary, as he very often did, walking up and down in this fashion out of doors. He found it easier to pray thus than kneeling down in a room, or a

church. All the same, because his mind was always alert and his eyes instantly observant, little parentheses rather than real distractions would now and then glint across his brain.

"It looks just like a puff of smoke blown over the brow of the little hill," said his eyes, as he raised them from the path in front of them, and they rested on the first thing they encountered—a mere mound half a mile away with a little tree, bare, of course, of leaves, peering over its top. The little tree grew just on the other side of the mound, which hid its trunk: the thin branches and twigs of it trailed southwest, for as the north-east wind blew they had grown.

The monk's father would have said:

"Your fine cloud is a small tree—I can see that though your eyes are forty years younger than mine."

Dom Placid smiled, and "recollected" himself.

"I offer this rosary," he said to Our Lady, "for your own Intention—for whatever you particularly are praying for to your Son at this moment. . . . 'Hail Mary, full of grace.' . . ."

When next he raised his eyes from the ground the two big trees, now close in front of him, seized them, and he thought, without ceasing to utter aloud his Hail Marys,

"The Two Brothers . . . for some Two Brothers I offer these prayers. It is your own command, not a distraction at all."

He was quite sure there were two brothers somewhere for whom God's Mother and their own was praying in Heaven and for whom she bade him pray. With immense depth of intention, and concentration of all the force of prayer, Dom Placidus prayed for those two brothers. . . .

But behind him came the thud of running feet upon the trodden, worn grass of the path behind him. Then the runner called out, and he turned, his words still appealing to the Mother of Mercy and Holy Hope, and his heart thrusting the appeal far up above itself. "Stop," cried the runner, panting, "here is one who has to confess . . ."

In a moment he had run up, and dropped on his knees upon the sodden earth.

"You are priest, as well as a monk?"

"Oh yes, my son—"

"Then, I confess—but, Father, it is not— No, I see, it is not to you I should confess first. I should go to confess first to those who can punish me—here, here on earth . . . to some justice."

"Our abbot has even summary jurisdiction here. He has indeed power of life and death——"

"Then take me to him: now, quick. For he can have me hanged to one of those trees . . ."

The young man's voice came in such gasps and gulps, he could only get out little scrappy phrases.

The young monk remembered that he had seen him earlier, the young man with the distraught face.

But what he said was:

"Those trees . . . 'The Two Brothers.' Hang you to one of them! God forbid . . ."

"Yes. I have murdered *my* brother. Just now. Come! Take me to the abbot. He must be told. . . . I had only one brother. There were . . . only two of us. Our mother had only two sons, and now none. Come to your abbot. I will tell him. *Then* I shall have the right to confess to you." "But," said the monk, standing stock still and holding the stammering young man by the hand from which his rosary still dangled. "But, you were alone. No one came with you. How could you—do what you say—'just now'?"

"He came after, and we quarrelled. Do come—if you wait I will go alone. The abbot must be easy to find."

"Perhaps not. The abbot has gone to Münster."

Heinrich uttered a miserable cry: "God won't let me do what I ought to do," he wailed.

"Hush," said the monk with a grave authority, but patiently, and gently all the same. Was this young man sane, was he deluded?

"Are you *sure* you did what you say?" he asked, still strongly holding the stranger by the elbow.

"Sure? Much too sure. I knocked him with all my force on the head, with a very heavy thing. And then I hanged him."

"Where?"

"In the inn. Back there. Will you come and see. . . . First I ran away not to be caught. Then I ran to—to get a priest and confess . . . then to do what is just and give myself up to justice."

"Suppose," said the monk, himself almost distraught, "suppose he was not really dead—not quite dead. . . ."

Whereupon Heinrich flung himself away from the monk's grasp, and ran back along the way by which he had come. The monk ran too, after him, trying as he ran to go on with the prayers that had had so ghastly an interruption.

"There is," thought he, "no doubt about the Two Brothers. She certainly did command prayers for them. . . ."

VII.

"No," said the medical student, "wine won't do. It must be brandy."

"Then you must find the Herr Kopf——"

"Herr Esel Kopf," thought the student.

"Which way is the cellar?"

"At the end of that corridor you go down five steps. Then turn to the left. Then up two steps. Then quite straight on past the still-room. Then down the turning steps and that is the cellar. But——"

"But you are a whole ass, head, tail and body," said the medical student, hurrying off whither Fräulein Elsa pointed the toe of the flat-footed stocking she was knitting. Poor Herr Kopf had hurried too—in a fashion, but a bad fashion. He was so much scandalized, upset, and confused that he kicked into a saddle on the floor (where it had no business) and stumbled and "barked " his shins. "That," thought he, "is Johann. He will leave saddles on the big dinner-table next. I wonder what my wife will advise about all this?" He really wished he had gone up to consult her.

The cellar-keys had tumbled out of his hands as he spread them out to keep himself from falling over and over. He felt all about for them, but they had chosen to fall under the saddle, and would not soon permit themselves to be found. "That," said the landlord, "is their way. They *like* to lose themselves."

Going down the five steps at the end of the corridor he trod upon an apple, and his foot slipped, for it was just at the edge of one of the steps, and it was a hard, obdurate apple, that did not squash right down, but only half squashed, leaving a slimy remnant that slid his foot right over the step, and jarred his insides shockingly.

"That wretched Gretchen," thought he as he went clattering down the rest of the steps, "she eats apples everywhere: and steals them first. In February they're none so common. In February an apple is an apple."

His descent was most disagreeable, but not fatal, you see, for these remarks did not come from beyond the tomb. He dropped the keys again, but did not lose them, for his right knee came plump down on them, and there was no doubt at all as to where they were. They were the boniest keys

imaginable with sixteen stone pressing down upon them. Even at the very door of the cellar a small delay occurred: for a venerable and huge slug had chosen to retreat that morning into the keyhole. The landlord loathed slugs, and while feeling with his finger and thumb for the keyhole he grasped this slug's tail, which quite made his flesh creep. He revolted absolutely from the idea of endeavouring to pull the dank, slimy thing out by its tail: and not much less from the alternative of squashing the key into the lock, slug or no slug . . .

"Well, what are *you* doing here," he asked, pretty tartly, as, having found the bin, and chosen his bottle, he was crossing the big, dim cellar on his way back to the door, and found the medical student groping his way among the barrels.

Quite an altercation followed: and throughout it the landlord clutched the bottle firmly.

When he and the medical student reached the room at the end of the stone passage, which did not occur even now so quickly as it would if Gretchen had not happened, unawares, to have been sitting on the cork-screw, which she could not be blamed for, as it was not supposed to be under the loose cushion of her wicker chair, but to hang on a nail just over that chair, and had been invited by nobody to fall off—when, I say, the landlord and the student, and the bottle of brandy arrived at the end of the stone passage and opened the door, the room where Heinrich and Hermann had been contained nobody at all.

"Hi," clucked the medical student, "have we gone up the chimney again!"

But the long leathern trace still lay on the floor.

"So he hasn't hung himself again," said the medical student.

"Who cut it in two?" demanded the landlord.

"I did! I had to cut him down."

"Was it round his neck?"

"No it wasn't. It was round his waist."

"But people don't hang themselves round their waists," objected the landlord, who objected thoroughly to the whole business. "There was," he remarked aggrievedly, "no occasion for brandy."

"Are you sure," asked the student, frowning severely, "that it *is* brandy?"

"Sure it is brandy? Of course. Natürlich sure am I."

And he extended the arm holding the bottle under the student's very nose.

With admirable promptness the student seized the bottle, and proved, to his own perfect satisfaction, that it *was* brandy—and old and excellent brandy also.

"So far," said he, "you are right. Now where is your guest?" This question he put with such severity as to awe the landlord most disagreeably.

"How can I say!"

"Well, he was seen to enter your house alive. And he was seen dead in it. No one saw him leave it alive. You will be asked where he is."

Being unwilling to be seen grinning the medical student thought he would blow his nose. But the sleeve up which he kept his handkerchief was empty. Of course—he had used it to sop his late patient's blood with.

"At the foot of the steps," said the landlord, who was now standing by the half-door to the garden, "there is a rag with blood on it. There among the dock leaves—to the right."

The medical student blushed: he was not a faultless person, but he never blushed at the recollection of his peccadilloes: it is a different matter to one and twenty to be confronted (before a witness) by one's own singularly grubby pocket-handkerchief described, not inaccurately, as a rag. The landlord, holding the bottle more firmly now he had regained it, went down the steps and lifted the handkerchief.

"It is not," he said, "at all the sort of handkerchief the deceased would own. It must be yours."

This was certainly offensive.

"Well, no one said it was yours," said the medical student.

"But I'll keep it," said the landlord, "it might be required in evidence, with the trace, and your knife, and your lancet. . . ."

"And your brandy bottle," the medical student interrupted flippantly. "The deceased, as you call him, seems to have legged it along there," and he pointed along the moist alley. "And, what's queer, he seems to have gone along there *twice*, without ever coming back to start again. . . ."

He wrinkled his forehead as well as he could, for he was extremely puzzled: he could not do it very well, for the skin on his bumpy little forehead was tightish. He followed the footsteps, regarding them inquisitively, and said:

"He didn't look much like running when I left him. . . ."

"Ha!" quoth the landlord suspiciously, "you didn't leave him till he was *past any running*!"

"None of that," said the student sharply.

"Suppose," suggested the landlord, clutching the bottle by the neck as a weapon, "suppose someone *carried* him off, though he *was* past running? You were, they tell me, to meet a friend here. He wasn't in the garden, was he? He didn't come in through the garden?"

"Oh, of course he did," scoffed the student, "with his boots on back to front."

But the landlord was not powerfully affected by sarcasm. He had not mentioned anybody's boots. And what more probable than that this expected friend should be another medical student. Had two medical students never carved *bodies*? The whole business was not only scandalous but uncanny. Why had such unusual and odd delays made his own journey to the cellar so long and full of mishaps? Body snatching students might know things they shouldn't know—uncanny things. The landlord knew as much as it behoved God-serving persons to know: further knowledge might easily be not only occult but derived from deplorable sources.

There was, indeed, nothing darkly preternatural about the student's appearance, chiefly notable by a tendency to pimples. Whoever yet, however, was acquitted of suspicion on the mere ground of pimples? The landlord was disposed to cross himself, but his right hand grasped the brandy, and he did not think it very respectful to cross himself with it.

VIII.

As Hermann hastened along he felt much less cold: motion and the brandy he had swallowed accounted for that: the same causes accounted, no doubt, for the fact of which he became aware that he was bleeding more. That was tiresome: might it prove worse than tiresome? Might he lose blood enough to cause him to faint or become too weak to move on? It would be awkward to faint out there, with no one at hand?

Across these thoughts other thoughts kept swaying. He was horribly ashamed of having treated his brother so scurvily. He knew from childhood (when he had over and over again provoked him, with cool taunts, into passion) how fiery and unreasoning his brother's temper was. A thousand times

their mother had said, "My son, you will have bitter cause to regret it some day. It is a sweet nature, Heinrich's: sweeter far, dear, than your own. Only so passionate. He loves you dearly. Why do you sting him, like a gadfly? Will God hold him the only guilty one if you provoke him some day to some sudden violence? I dream frightful things about you, after you have had a quarrel. Three different dreams have I had, with the same horrible story in each of them. He, maddened by you, and you—but I cannot tell it. It is too hideous. Only, one of you gone beyond repentance, and the other left unable by any repentance to alter a deed done. . . . To your Mother in heaven I plead ceaselessly for you: for both, for the two brothers who are more her sons than my own. Ah, but do not make even her help unavailing. . . ."

All this Hermann remembered, and much else. He *had* stolen a march on his brother in the matter of Gertrude. He *had* been false, not to a worded promise, but to a well understood compact. And had he not belittled his brother to her, had he not given her to think Heinrich shallow and unstable, and light of love, running after a fancy and then running away from it after a newer fancy? Without seeking a quarrel, that very day, with his brother, had he not, when the quarrel came, made use of it, thinking it would serve his turn to make an excuse out of it to hold no terms with poor Heinrich, but go on more unscrupulously with his plan of ousting him from his first place with Gertrude?

If Heinrich *had* killed him, would God be so stupid as only to judge *him*, Heinrich who had struck the sudden, unplanned blow? And if he, Hermann, had been killed what would they have done to his brother? What would Heinrich do to himself? And on whose broken heart would it all fall for ever? Their mother's.

Yes—what would Heinrich do to himself if he had killed Hermann?

Suddenly it all rushed into Hermann's mind—Heinrich had believed he *had* killed his brother. What had he rushed away to do to himself, in his terrible madness and anguish?

"Mother of Jesus!" Hermann cried. He stood stock still, and his brain began to reel drunkenly. All around his heart he felt cold again, cold, ever so cold, and sick, sick, sick.

"What will you do?" some voice moaned in his ear. It was just like his mother's voice, only distant, and gasping, as if it strove and strove to reach to him from ever so far off.

"Oh, mother, *what* can I do!" he cried out.

Then again he moaned.

"Tell me! Mother of Pity and Pain, Mother of Jesus Christ, *what can* I do?"

"Ah!" he cried out suddenly, "I promise! If Heinrich is not gone beyond my calling after him: if you will make him be alive—I promise. I will not try to steal Gertrude from him. She is his *really*: I know that: only I could steal her. I will not . . . this is my promise. Listen to it. Sign it with me—show it to Jesus Christ, sealed with this ugly blood that flows from me; do not let it . . ." And with his promise he staggered and fell.

IX.

Running, running as one who stutters with his feet, Heinrich came round the curve of the path, the young monk very close behind him. Dom Placid was not lean, but he was light of frame, and he knew very well how to run. He and Heinrich saw Hermann almost simultaneously, though not quite. Both saw him as he fell.

"Oh," cried Heinrich in his heart that gave a terrible jump, "Mother of Christ who called the dead back from beyond the gate tell your Son to make him be alive. If He makes him be alive I will give him all he wants and I wanted. She shall go to him, instead of coming to me. Let that be for my punishment, not my brother's blood on my head. . . ."

Up in heaven the Queen of Mothers was listening, and her Son was listening, as through all the ages, to her. She was not now ashamed of them. Her Son had boasted one night, when on earth it was hard winter, of having a soldier's cloak given to Him. Might she not boast, with tender smiling, of what the two lads had given, all either of them had? Was not her Son as pityingly proud of their stammering gift as she?

"Which," asked the muddled landlord, "is the deceased?"

"Deuce knows," said the medical student, bending over the brothers, who lay side by side, Heinrich's arm flung across Hermann's breast, as if it were near twenty years ago, and they were little pretty children again.

The young monk knelt beside the student, and the student liked his face. He liked him altogether. Among other reasons because he held his tongue: but therein the medical student was mistaken, for the monk was talking, insistently,

only he made no sound, and he was not talking to any one on earth.

"It was for your own intention you told me to pray," he urged, "for the two brothers. You were doing it all the time, all their lives. Tell all the saints to do it now, *now*. They were so near Hell—but with all the distance of your own pity between it and them. Tell St. Dominic to give this rosary to them . . . maybe their own mother, whose body bore them both, is not at this instant praying for them, so go on praying for them, as she would if she knew. . . ."

"Hi," clicked the student, looking suddenly up, "is it going to rain?"

It was quite true that the drop that fell on Hermann's forehead came down from heaven, though through a young monk's eyes.

Even before he had begun his insistent appeal to the young men's Mother in Heaven, he had absolved them both, first in a great dread of haste together—then severally.

The landlord was bending forward so much unconscious of himself that some of his brandy out of the tilted bottle dribbled down upon Hermann's face.

"Good," quoth the medical student, "I had forgotten that."

Concerning Heinrich he was not in the least alarmed.

"A perfectly honest faint," he told himself. As for Hermann it was not quite so simple. *Had* he taken something? Or was it just a brief collapse? His heart was beating, though weakly and unsteadily.

It so happened that both brothers sat up together. They smiled upon each other, as if quite unconscious of any other presence, and Hermann whispered:

"Let us kiss each other, as our mother made us do when we had been quarrelling long ago. . . . She must never know of this our last quarrel."

It was enough that their other Mother knew and had intervened.

As Hermann lifted himself the medical student removed his hand from his patient's heart.

"This," thought he, "is a queer heart: not a bad one, but tricky."

The landlord, who had a discursive mind, had been looking round.

"This field," he remarked irrelevantly, "is often called the field of the Two Brothers, but its old name was Mariahilf."

JOHN AYSCOUGH.

MISCELLANEA

I. CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES

IRISH SONG-TUNES IN SHAKESPEARE'S DAY.

THE subject of Irish Song-Tunes in the days of Shakespeare has never been adequately treated. With the exception of "Callino Castureme" and "Ducdame," the commentators of Shakespeare's plays have been strangely reticent as to the vogue of Irish song-tunes in England during the second half of the sixteenth century. The present writer was the first to point out the Irish provenance of eleven of the tunes mentioned by the Bard of Avon, in a special chapter in his *History of Irish Music* (1915). Probably Shakespeare visited Ireland, and, even if he did not, he had various friends who could have given him first-hand information, like Lord Southampton, John Douland, Thomas Campion, and others. His use of Irish words such as *feere*, *gech*, *cam*, *cailliach*, *sprag*, *Kerne*, *gallern glass*, *bog*, *brach*, *sop*, *crick*, *bard*, *afeard*, *rug-headed*, etc., is worthy of note.

It has been stated that the introduction of Irish dances into English plays only dates from Elizabethan times, but there is good reason to believe that Irish dances were employed in the first half of the sixteenth century. They were certainly introduced in a "Masque of Irishmen," produced at Court on January 6, 1550—1, and in a "Masque of Irishwomen" performed at Court during the Shrovetide of 1551. Further, it is on record that, in a "Mask of Almains, Pilgrims, and Irishmen," performed before Queen Mary," on April 25, 1557, dances were played by two Irish bagpipers.

Passing over the Irish tunes in Shakespeare's *Henry V.* (circa 1598—9), Thomas Platter, of Basle, in his Diary, describes his visit to a London theatre on September 21, 1599, and mentions that, at the conclusion of the play (*Julius Cæsar*), he saw the customary dances. At another theatre, the Curtain, in Shoreditch, he also noted the convention of dancing at the end of the play: "They danced, in English and *Irish* fashion, very elegantly." In the oft-quoted letter from the Earl of Worcester to the Earl of Shrewsbury, under date of September 19, 1602, we read: "We are frolic here in Court; much dancing in the Privy Chamber of Country

Dances before the Queen's Majesty, who is exceedingly pleased therewith. *Irish* tunes are at this time most liked."

The old Irish "Riunce Fada," or the "Long Dance," was extremely popular in Elizabethan days in England, and was for shortness called the Fada, or the Fading. It is mentioned in the fourth act of *A Winter's Tale*, and is acknowledged as Irish by Chappell. As late as 1672 Thomas Jordan set a song in his "London Triumphant" to the tune of "With a Fading."

Other Irish song-tunes of the late sixteenth century period are: "Concobine," "Obeve, obeve," "Bragandary," "Labaudalasboth," "Shillimafago," "Dunboyne," etc. An "Irish Dance" is printed in that unique music book called *Parthenia Inviolata*, dating from circa 1613-14, now, alas! in the Public Library, New York.

Shakespeare quotes "Concobine" in *Love's Labour Lost* (Act III., sc. i.); while "Labaudalasboth" (also spelled "Labaudolosobot")—used by Shakespeare in *Hamlet* and in *The Merry Wives of Windsor*—is quoted in R. Eduard's *A Handfull of Pleasant Delites* (1584), and was sung at the Kenilworth Revels, in 1575. It was introduced into *Misogonus*, circa 1562, and several ballads were sung to it.

"Obeve, obeve" is another name for "Essex's Last Good Night," and was composed by Richard Barret, Irish harper for Walter Devereux, Earl of Essex, who died in Dublin on September 21, 1576. The tune was subsequently used for a song on the execution of the unfortunate Robert, Earl of Essex, in 1601-2.

"Shillimafago" is the Anglicized corruption of "Seilcheogabhuaic," pronounced "Shilligafooc," and indifferently "Shilligafooka"—which means "Snail in a shell." The tune will be found in the first edition of Playford's *Dancing Master*, in 1651.

"Ducdame" has been proved to be a corruption of "Duca me," or "Tuca me," the thrice emphatic answer of the fair lady in the song of "Eileen Aroon"—the analogue of "Come hither, come hither, come hither"—and points to the popularity of the delightful song-tune, subsequently claimed by the Scotch as "Robin Adair." This "invitation" and "answer" are clearly present in the Irish song, in which, moreover occurs the phrase "Cead mile failte" ("A hundred thousand welcomes"), used by Shakespeare in Agrippa's greeting to Coriolanus. It is probable that the whole song

was sung in *Henry V.*, and there is good reason to believe that Joe Harris introduced it: indeed, Pepys tells us that Harris's *Irish* song was "the strangest in itself and the prettiest sung by him that ever I heard." I may add that this Irish song was sung (to phonetic Irish words) by Mrs. Cibber, in August, 1741, words and music being printed on a half-sheet by Walshe, of London. Fifty years earlier John Abell sang Irish songs in London, one of which was printed (with music) in 1701.

Fynes Moryson, in the early years of the seventeenth century, alludes to the Irish dance-tunes then in vogue; and it is not generally known that Queen Elizabeth had at Court an Irish harper, Cornice MacDermot, who, in 1603, had the then large salary of £46 10s. a year. It is, also, to be noted that Ben Jonson, in his *Irish Masque* (1613), introduces two Irish harpers; while both Dekker and Jonson so far observed the unities as to quote several lines of Irish—in capital orthography.

W. H. GRATTAN FLOOD.

THE GLASTONBURY BUBBLE PRICKED.

FOUR years ago Mr. Frederick Bligh Bond, the Director of Excavations at Glastonbury Abbey, published a book in which he made the claim that by means of automatic writing he had acquired certain items of antiquarian knowledge regarding the Abbey church, which could not have been arrived at by any normal process of inference, but the accuracy of which, it is alleged, was fully verified by the investigations afterwards carried out. The details thus disclosed were in themselves of no great moment to the world at large. Whether the Edgar chapel had an absidal termination or not, whether there was a door at the east end, whether the glass of the windows was white or azure blue, and whether the Loreto building opened directly into the transept or was separated from it by a covered way, are questions which have little interest for any but professed architects. But the possibility of obtaining trustworthy information about historical or scientific facts through some supermundane intelligence is a matter concerning which hardly anyone can feel indifference. No argument has been urged more successfully against the believers in spiritualistic communication than the fact that in more than seventy years such

messages from the *au delà* have added absolutely nothing to the sum of human knowledge. And this has hitherto been admitted by automatists themselves. The well-known scientist, M. Flammarion, has been devoted to *spiritisme* for more than fifty years. At one time he practised automatic writing and, as he himself tells us, he obtained long messages on philosophical and astronomical subjects signed "Galileo." But after a little experience he was satisfied that all these communications were illusory. "There can be no doubt," he declares, "that these thoughts were wholly the product of my own intelligence, and that the illustrious Florentine had nothing to do with them." And he goes on to say: "It has been the same with all communications of the astronomical class; they have not led the science forward one single step. Nor has any obscure, mysterious or elusive point in history been cleared up by the spirits."¹ Consequently, when Mr. Bligh Bond claims to demonstrate the contrary by his own personal experience, he must expect the evidence he adduces to be very closely scrutinized. Within a few weeks of the appearance of *The Gate of Remembrance* the validity of the writer's proofs was challenged in these pages,² and it is perhaps desirable to make it clear that we have not seen reason to modify one single criticism made in that article, now four years old. We pointed out then that whereas Mr. Bond in his book somehow manages to leave the impression that in 1907, when the automatic writing began, there was no reason to suppose that a large chapel had ever existed at the east end of the Abbey church, any careful study of the evidence at once shows that precisely the contrary was the case. Both in the seventeenth century and in the eighteenth century, the writers who concerned themselves with Glastonbury declared that the church was 580 or even 594 feet long. Now the ruins existing in 1907 showed no greater length than about 500 feet. Obviously at the one end or the other there must have been a prolongation of eighty feet or so, and everything indicated that this was to be looked for at the east end. But, as if this were not enough, one of the most copious works on Glastonbury, a work which Mr. Bond expressly refers to as studied by himself and his automatist friend, explicitly draws this inference and speaks unhesitatingly of "that noble chapel of 90 feet in length which previously to

¹ C. Flammarion, *Mysterious Psychic Forces*, Eng. Trans.; Boston, 1907, p. 49.

² "Veridical Automatism?" in *THE MONTH*, March, 1918. pp. 249-261.

the desecration of the sacred pile terminated to the east the great church of Glaston Abbey." We cannot, then, see anything in the least remarkable in the fact that the subconsciousness of the automatist "John Alleyne" (who is now known to be a Mr. J. Allen Bartlett, "for some time occupied in Mr. Bond's own office") produced many sheets of script regarding this chapel capable of being interpreted, with some adjustment, in fair accord with the facts which excavation subsequently revealed. If the contradiction between the script and the excavations had been gross and palpable, the public would never have heard a word about these experiments in automatism, any more than the public have heard anything of the results of the inquiries addressed to the spirits by many automatists in connection with the recent murder of Miss Irene Wilkins at Bournemouth.

If we are led to recur to the matter here it is because a pamphlet has lately been published by one of Mr. Bond's critics, the Rev. H. J. Wilkins, D.D., discussing in considerable detail the material collected in the last edition (1921) of the *Gate of Remembrance*, and arriving at conclusions diametrically opposed to those of the author.¹ In contradiction to one of the most characteristic theories defended in the volume named, Dr. Wilkins states uncompromisingly: "There never was an apse at the east of the rectangular chapel [of St. Edgar] and consequently no door in the east end." He contends, and in our judgment fully justifies his contention, that nothing veridical is to be found in the script save what reasonable conjecture from existing data might very naturally suggest to the subconscious intelligence of the automatist. He shows that in not a few instances the script makes positive misstatements, as, for example, when it says: "Search far for the east end of Edgar's Chapel. It is but little damaged" (p. 51), which is as directly contrary to the fact as such an announcement can well be. He points out how Mr. Bond himself in his Reports addressed to the Somerset Archæological Society—these were most of them printed before the idea of publishing the automatic script was seriously entertained—gives away the sources of data which fully explain how certain ideas may have germinated in the mind of the automatist. It is no doubt true that the script on February 19, 1908, announced that "ye chamber (of the

¹ *False Psychical Claims in the "Gate of Remembrance" concerning Glastonbury Abbey.* By H. J. Wilkins, D.D. Bristol: Arrowsmith. Price, 2s. 6d. net. 1922.

Edgar chapel) was in length seventy feet in four bays" (p. 43), and that the fact that there were four bays in the chapel was only verified by excavation six months later. But, as Dr. Wilkins shows, given a chapel of about that length (and the length itself was a necessary inference from the data supplied by Browne Willis and Hearne), then the division into four bays might easily be conjectured by any experienced architect. In his first Report, Mr. Bond wrote: "The character of certain fragments still preserved at the Abbey tends to show that there was somewhere in the Abbey a vaulted roof of a nature designed for a width of some 25 feet and for bays of about 12ft. 6in., constructed in a manner somewhat similar to the roof of Henry VII.'s Chapel at Westminster."¹ Now these fragments existed and must have been studied by Mr. Bond and Mr. Allen Bartlett before ever they sat down to their experiments in automatism. The Edgar chapel was known to have been built at the period when such vaulting with fan tracery was in vogue. What more natural than to infer that the bays of this estimated length belonged to the Edgar chapel?

We should like to follow Dr. Wilkins in his dissection of the series of scripts dealing with the Loreto Chapel, for it was by the results of the excavations in this second case that the veridical character of Mr. Bond's automatism was to stand or fall. Dr. Wilkins has had time to go thoroughly into the details, he possesses the necessary antiquarian and local knowledge, and in our judgment he has shown convincingly that "there is absolutely nothing super-mundane in the whole of the script and no room for 'cosmic memory' (whatever may be the definition of that vague postulate), or for disincarnate monks or other disincarnate entities." What we have to bear in mind throughout is that Mr. Bond, to carry us with him, is bound to present an absolutely convincing case, not a bare possibility. Not a single instance of veridical automatism in any scientific or antiquarian matter is so far on record. Mr. Bond has to prove that where the script is in accord with the facts, as subsequently ascertained by excavation, no materials existed by which the truth could reasonably be conjectured, and this proof he has wholly failed to supply. What is more, we are inclined to go further even than Dr. Wilkins and to urge that there is no scrap of real evidence to identify the foundations recently unearthed with

¹ *Somerset Archaeological Soc. Proceedings*, Vol. LIV. (1908), p. 119.

those of the true Loreto chapel. The traces of a building found between the North Porch and the south-west corner of the nave, which Mr. Bond indicates in Plate II. of his Fifth Report (1912) and describes as "Footings of Building not identified," seem to us to have been quite undeservedly ignored. What is certain is that these footings prove the existence of a structure on the north side of the nave *which is the exact length (internal measurement) of the Santa Casa of Loreto, i.e., 31½ feet.*¹ The precise breadth has not yet been ascertained, but the breadth Mr. Bond assigns to it conjecturally in his plan is just the breadth of the Santa Casa. Writing in 1878, Mr. Edmund Waterton, F.S.A., assumed that Abbot Beere's chapel would naturally be a sort of facsimile of the little building at Loreto.² It even appears from Mr. Bond's Ninth Report (1919, p. 81) that he and "Captain Bartlett" (alias John Alleyne) inclined at first to the belief that this building was the Loreto chapel, until the automatic script directed their thoughts elsewhere.

In conclusion, it should be noted that we do not necessarily identify ourselves with all the details of Dr. Wilkins' argument. We think he is prone to lay unreasonable stress upon the accuracy of early measurements, and it also seems to us that his statement of the complicated matter under discussion is sometimes needlessly involved and wanting in clearness. But the general soundness of his conclusions will, we are sure, impress itself upon all intelligent readers who will take the trouble to study carefully the evidence he provides.

H. T.

¹ We do not understand what can have suggested to both Mr. Bond and Dr. Wilkins that the dimensions of the Sancta Casa are uncertain. The data given by authorities like Hutchison, Garratt, Hüffer, Beissel, etc., agree within a few inches. Also it should be remembered that the Walsingham "Holy House" was older than, and in no way dependent on, the Santa Casa di Loreto.

² Waterton, *Pietas Mariana Britannica*, Part I., p. 78.

II. TOPICS OF THE MONTH

Pope Pius XI.

No Heir to the Throne on succeeding to the royal power experiences so vast a change of condition as does the Cardinal who is elected Pope. From merely local eminence, the rule of some great diocese, some high position in the Church, he becomes the foremost figure in the world, dowered with the plenitude of supernatural authority and jurisdiction, the object of the heart-felt devotion of hundreds of millions, a monarch to whom even the non-Catholic pays unwilling homage, whether by respect and reverence or hate and fear. To that high dignity on February 6th passed his Eminence Cardinal Achille Ratti, Archbishop of Milan, and assumed with the Triple Crown the venerated name of Pius. The secular and religious press alike have made the world familiar with the life-history of the new Pope, whose accession is welcomed with especial cordiality by the learned bodies of every land, acquainted with him as a scholar and a pioneer of literary research. But athletes as well as professors have found points of contact with one who has a reputation as a devoted and accomplished mountaineer. That in his time he has climbed Stamford Hill and bussed from there to the British Museum brings him close to the multitudes of this great city, whilst Manchester for the industrial North and Oxford as representing English culture can both claim the acquaintance of the new Vicar of Christ. Catholics will rejoice that their new Pope is so fitted by character and experience for the duties of his high office, but they will find even fuller consolation in the records of his priestly life at Milan and in the significance of his choice of name, which links him both with the fearless upholder of the rights of the Church and with the saintly Pastor who did so much to stimulate her devotional life. That his first utterance, like the last of the dying Benedict, should be a plea for peace was only to be expected—could the Vicar of the Prince of Peace have any dearer desire than that all God's children should live together in amity?—but he gave this desire additional emphasis by declaring officially that he intended his first public blessing, *Urbi et Orbi*, from the balcony of St. Peter's to be "a token and an assertion of his purpose to work for the universal restoration of peace, the longing of all men's hearts." That his Holiness may find means to enlighten a world gone astray after false ideals of greatness and prosperity will be the fervent prayer of all his children.

**European
Peace.**

It is said that the late Pope had already begun a draft of a letter to the coming Conference of Genoa on the subject of European peace. On that Conference, indeed, depends the prospects of peace in our days, for it is the first since the war wherein all the nations concerned are invited to sit. Long before the end of the war, Pope Benedict laid down, with a foresight becoming more evident every day, the only foundations on which the world's prosperity can be rebuilt. The Peace Note of August 1, 1917, was thought a "hard saying" by those who were conscious of a high mission to resist the Prussian attack upon public right, and may still seem hard now that that attack has been broken and beaten back at such terrific cost. Is there to be no reparation, no recompense for the sacrifices made? That is precisely the point which Pope Benedict's prescience illumines. "As to reparation of damage," he says, "and as to the costs of the war, we see no way to solve the question save by laying down as a general principle complete and reciprocal condonation, a course which would find its justification in the immense benefits that would accrue from disarmament. . . . If in certain cases special reasons [for reparation] exist, let them be weighed with justice and equity." In that last sentence the Pope evidently had in mind the wanton damage done to Belgian and French property during the German occupation. But nothing was further from the minds of the statesmen at Versailles, nor from those of the war-weary victorious peoples whom they represented, than condonation. No one believed the Pope; the vain endeavour "to make Germany pay" has been pursued, until inexorable political and economic forces have made his view almost a truism. A prominent French statesman and capitalist, M. Loucheur, has lately several times declared that France can never pay her debts to America,¹ and that Germany cannot pay the Allies without ruining their trade. Yet the Allies are maintaining colossal armaments so as to be able to exact from Germany gold which is not there or the profits on German exports which can only come into being when Germany has captured their trade. The Allies would gain more, as has often been pointed out, by the restoration of peace to Europe than by the exaction, at the cost of their own commerce and by dint of their own expenditure

¹ "You ask us to pay our war debts. We cannot pay. We cannot pay now and we cannot pay ever. No clear-headed man with a real knowledge of financial facts has the remotest idea that we can ever pay. The only possible way in which we could pay is in our goods, and you will not take our goods. We cannot pay in our currency. You will not take that. You demand gold, and you have all the gold in the world in your own vaults. And now you prepare to erect a tariff wall round your country that will still more completely bar out our goods."—*Times*, Feb.

on armaments, of the reparations with which their late foes are assessed.

**The Results
of
Washington.**

The belligerent atmosphere which still broods over Europe was able to blight to some extent the promise of Washington. Mr. Balfour has returned and has been welcomed by the same outburst of optimistic prophecies that gave him God-speed sixteen weeks ago. Yet, compared with our hopes and compared with what Christianity, not to say common sense, would suggest in international relations, the results of the Washington Conference, still to be ratified by the various peoples concerned, have been disappointingly small. A certain reduction in capital ships only, likely enough to become obsolete in any case,¹ and a tonnage tariff as regards certain other war vessels, may mean economy, if the Naval Powers do not find other belligerent uses for the money saved. The restoration of Shantung to China heals an open sore in international dealings, though many others remain. The accord amongst the Pacific Governments to respect each other's rights in regard to China would be more satisfying to the demands of justice if China herself were an equal party to the pact. In fact, in all this achievement we see little trace of that "new era" which was so magniloquently heralded and is now with equal eloquence acclaimed. Mr. Balfour, responding on February 20th to the speeches of welcome, spoke of the benefits of "mutual human intercourse of man to man and soul to soul."

As soon [he said] as that was done, it became perfectly clear that we wanted to get the same thing, that we were determined to get the same thing, that we trusted each other and knew that neither of us had a motive which did not bear the light of day.

But, it will be seen, Mr. Balfour was speaking for only two of the Conference Powers, and even if England and America had abandoned old strivings of rival ambitions, there were enough left to imprint their mark on the Conference as a whole. The most that can be said of it is that it makes a good beginning: it remains for the peoples concerned to insist on further advance

¹ The American Ambassador on Feb. 20 admirably summed up the main results of his country's action: "She made no sacrifice—none. She scrapped many costly warships, she abandoned vast projects of fortification, she snuffed at the false pride of becoming the first naval Power, she snuffed out what was left of her great army; but all these doings involved no sacrifice; they constituted a boon, they reduced taxes, they released present millions and future billions of dollars for development of lands and industries, they transferred brawn and skill from floating slaughter-houses to shops and factories for the building of homes and churches and schools; so far from entailing loss, they produced only gain to ourselves and to the world."

in the same direction. Meanwhile it is pleasant to record that Mr. Balfour has, since his return, more than once enunciated the sound political principle that every nation gains by the prosperity of the rest.¹ If Washington has convinced all statesmen of that fact alone it may indeed usher in a new era.

Is there
to be a Change
of Heart.

What the other mentality leads to was candidly confessed by more than one speaker who wished to enhance the achievements of Washington. It seems incredible after what

we have so recently gone through, but we have the Prime Minister's word for it, that but for the Washington Conference another war might have broken out in the Pacific.

At any moment [said Mr. Lloyd George on February 16th] there was a danger that things might happen that would once more precipitate the world into the carnage and horror of a great war. I am not exaggerating the danger. If you remember, there were whispering murmurs in the wind about preparations, about projects, about what might happen here and certainly would happen there. Everywhere there were these rumours and suspicions. The President of the United States of America rendered a service to humanity by taking the situation in time and by dealing with it.

And at the same banquet Mr. Balfour echoed these words in the following terms:

Certainly four months ago I do not believe anybody anticipated, however much they may have desired it, that the vast area of the Pacific Ocean, and its limitrophe continents, would in so short a space change from an area in which anxiety, preparation for possible war, competing expenditure, mutual suspicion, something approaching mutual fear,

¹ Speaking of the Nine Powers engaged he said (Feb. 20): "None of their representatives go back to their native land without being able to claim that they have furthered the interests of the world and that in furthering the interests of the world they have furthered the interests of their own people." A sentiment which on Feb. 16th he had uttered in still stronger terms: "They never were the slaves of the preposterous fallacy that there was a certain fixed amount of advantage to be got by somebody, and that if one nation got it another nation lost it; that the sum could not be increased, and that it was only a question of how this fixed maximum of advantage should be distributed among the various claims. The note was struck from the very beginning by the United States, and throughout, I believe, the sincere and only desire of those on whom the ultimate decisions on these points came to rest was, not this or that petty national advantage, but that far greater national advantage which comes from good international arrangements. They illustrated what the world has been slow to learn, which is that the advantage of the part is best to be reached by the advantage of the whole."

were prevalent or were not uncommon phenomena—that in four months that would change, as it has undoubtedly changed, to a condition of things in which all those wretched symptoms which threatened the renewal in the West of some of the horrors we have been going through in Europe and the East—that that state of things should completely, as far as I can judge, come to an end.

Such avowals by such men at such a time as this, when the evils of the world-war are still with us and gradually becoming more and more evident, prompt the queries: Why should the Pacific area so belie its name? What Power or Powers had learnt so little from Armageddon as even to contemplate another conflict? And what are the democracies of the world doing to prevent their being involved again in so portentous a calamity?

**The Cause
of War.**

If they want to do anything effective they must enforce upon their rulers a practical recognition of the truth to which, from time to time, these rulers pay homage, viz., that the modern world is so interdependent that the sickness or health of each member affects the rest. It is not so with individuals. A man may profit by his neighbour's ruin: a Stock Exchange gambler, a successful burglar, an unhandg profiteer, may grow rich by his own injustice, but so long as the nations are not self-contained and self-supporting, but closely linked together by the bonds of commerce, each must depend upon the prosperity of the others. Why is not this obvious fact recognized in their mutual dealings? Because Governments are influenced by sectional interests, aiming at capturing trade, finding exclusive markets and making profits. The whole Pacific danger, as revealed by our statesmen, arose from this clash of sectional interests, the fear that the rich markets of China would be monopolized by the traders of one or other of the great Powers. The fear is a natural one as industry is now organized: self regard always prompts to seizing the immediate advantage, especially as, if foregone, it would be seized by someone else. The loss of a foreign market means unemployment at home: the extent of unemployment suggests the search for new markets and therefore conflict with other seekers. There is no means of severing the alliance between Mammon and Mars except by forswearing all allegiance to the former, and giving up the unchecked pursuit of gain.

**For Service
rather than for
Profit.**

But desire of gain, *i.e.*, the pursuit of happiness connected with it, is the stimulus of all endeavour. We must want before we try to get. Covetousness, which is the root of all evil, is also the source of all progress. Can any general sub-

stitute be found for a motive which is not wrong in itself and is seemingly essential and only prolific of evil when overstressed and abused? Or, in other words, is there any hope that in the bulk of mankind self-regard will become so enlightened as to seek personal happiness through the happiness of the community? Many reformers urge that individual profit-seeking should be abandoned in favour of general social service. There is a growing feeling amongst Christian thinkers that the question of dividends demands further consideration from the moral point of view. Usury, as we have often pointed out, is rife in the commercial world.¹ Is the only way to cure immoderate profit-seeking with all its attendant evils, national and international, the abolition of the motive altogether? Lord Blyth, in "A Message for Industry," which he published at the beginning of the year, states "that the function of industry is to serve the needs of the community." Few of those engaged in it would subscribe to that assertion. The worker labours for his livelihood, the manager for his salary, the middleman for his profits, whilst the investor looks only to his dividends. To all these people industry is a means to a personal end. Woe to the directors of any Company who should put the interests of the nation or of the consumer or of the worker before those of the shareholders. They are very careful not to.² An improvement in drinking-habits would save the community much in health and pocket, but brewers' dividends would fall. If women defied the absurd and grotesque decrees of fashion, thrift and morality would benefit, but dividends would fall. If the League of Nations succeeded in replacing war by arbitration, the world would be happier and more prosperous, but there would be a terrible slump in armament shares. But directors *qua* directors could not but lament all these causes of shrinking dividends, and thus, at any rate in all luxury trades, personal profit-seeking tends to be anti-social, and mankind would benefit, other things being equal, by its stringent regulation in the general interest.

¹ A prospectus reached us the other day, regarding a new "Cinema de Luxe" to be erected in a fashionable quarter, which promised investors a return of 30 per cent, and sound security. The promoters had apparently no suspicion of the grossly usurious character of their proposal, no idea that money like every other commodity has a fair price.

² On retiring from the chairmanship of the Midland Railway Company the other day, Mr. Charles Booth assured the shareholders that "your board will not do anything which will in any material way adversely affect the dividends at present paid to the shareholders."

**The
Christianization
of Industry.**

There are a number of organizations in existence at present whose aim is to restore to industry the ethical guidance which was formally and definitely set aside by English economists for many years after the time of the industrial revolution. Foremost amongst them in interest to Catholics is, of course, the Catholic Social Guild, which from its central offices at Oxford, and aided by various local workers, is keeping up a steady formative influence throughout the country. Short of spreading the Faith itself nothing is of more importance than this inculcation of right views on economics. The day is rapidly approaching when "Labour," whether fit or not, will be in the seat of power. At the moment the Government holds office by favour of the workers. Out of the twenty millions who have the franchise less than three pay income-tax. Once the wage-earners are united they will fill Parliament with their nominees, and unless their views in regard to the family and the right of private property are definitely Christian, we shall be exposed to experiments such as have ruined Russia. There is also an influential group called "The Conference on Christian Politics, Economics and Citizenship," which is labouring on practically Catholic lines at the Christianization of social life, and quite recently, in the business and professional world itself, an organization has started called "The National Movement towards a Christian Order of Industry and Commerce," which has formulated the following "demands" as what is imperatively needed by modern conditions:

1. The governing motive and regulative principle of all industry and commerce should be service of the community.
2. The receipt of an income lays on the individual the duty of rendering service in accordance with his capacity. Every person should perform the best possible work.
3. The receipt of an income from industry should carry with it a responsibility for the conditions and purpose of the industry.
4. Any competition should be subordinated to the service of the community.
5. Industry should create and develop human fellowship, and any practices calculated to destroy such fellowship are immoral.
6. The value of all natural resources and of every privilege which owes its worth to the labour of all or to the necessities of all should be held and utilized for the benefit of all.
7. Every individual man and woman is of intrinsic worth, and human labour cannot be regarded as a commodity. Therefore, every industry should be organized to provide:
 - (1) As a first charge an income sufficient to maintain, in reasonable comfort, all engaged in it.
 - (2) Provision for any special burden to which those engaged in the industry may be liable, such as undue fluctuations in work, sickness, etc., owing to the conditions of that industry—this in addition to any general provision which may be made by the State or otherwise.

- (3) Provision for superannuation—this in addition to any general provision which may be made by the State or otherwise.
- (4) Healthy conditions for all engaged in the industry.
- (5) Opportunities for development of personality, talents and self-expression.

It will be seen that the above requirements cannot for the most part be fulfilled by legislation: they are rather a statement of what in a thoroughly Christian community public opinion would call for. Wherefore it is obvious that without a deepening and spreading of personal religion they will largely be inoperative. Is there any sign of the leaders in industry becoming generally more religious? Much will depend on the energies of bodies like the foregoing and much, we may add, upon those wide-spread and growing Catholic associations of professional and business men—the Catenians and the Knights of St. Columbas, who have the clear and definite tradition of the Church behind them.

**Communist
Propaganda
amongst Children.**

Christians have to combat, not only the apathy caused by blind acquiescence in age-long conditions and practices in industry, the ignorance of those who "take no interest" in social questions and are content to follow tradition without applying the test of Christian principles, but also an active anti-Christian propaganda carried on in the ultra-Socialist interest amongst the working classes. Some twelve years ago we commented in *THE MONTH* on a certain "Red Catechism"¹ employed by Socialists to inoculate children with their erroneous social and economic theories. In 1907 the L.C.C. prohibited the use of this catechism in public elementary schools on Sundays—a prohibition which we gather is still rightly enforced, for the doctrines taught by the "Red Catechism" and similar publications are wholly subversive of Christian civilization. An organization called the "British Empire Union" has published a pamphlet setting forth the aims and methods of these Godless extremists, and giving examples of the crude and shallow philosophy that inspires them. But much more is needed than exposure and repression. We should have been glad to see in the B.E.U.'s pamphlet some recognition of the un-Christian elements of our social system, the glaring abuses which furnish fuel for rebellion. It is no use saying "how awful are the projects of these Communists" unless we also say "how awful are the practices of these Capitalists." As long as there are slums and sweating, destitution and unemployment, luxury and idleness; as long as industry is carried on regardless of the dignity of the human soul and the guidance of the moral law, and Christians make no ef-

¹ *THE MONTH*, January, 1910.

fective protest nor urge the remedies of their creed, so long will the tortured spirit of man seek release in revolt against conditions which, in his ignorance, he identifies with Christianity.

**Communist
Propaganda
amongst Workers.**

The B.E.U. denounces the evil wrought on the susceptible minds and hearts of children by these "Socialist and Proletarian" Sunday Schools. But the revolt against the current industrial system appears, as is well known, at the other end of the educational scale, in the curricula of Ruskin College at Oxford and other Labour Colleges in various industrial centres. The organ of these various institutions is a monthly paper called *The Plebs*, expounding a frankly materialistic anti-Christian philosophy, and *The Plebs* has lately published a "Text Book of Psychology," which is reviewed in the March issue of *The Christian Democrat*. The paper and the book form an appalling revelation of the ignorance of these blind leaders of the blind, and of the speed with which they are proceeding to the abyss. In the paper the "class-war" is assiduously preached—the nemesis which has slowly but surely followed the denial of human rights to the workers—and the "Psychology," as the *Christian Democrat* points out, is mere atheistic propaganda. Its authors disclaim all impartial search for truth. In regard to the question of Freewill or Determinism, they say: "This question is not settled. We shall make no attempt to settle it. We like determinism better. If we don't take it the desired conclusions will not follow, so let us have determinism." It is stuff like this that is put into the hands of the workers who are aspiring after a liberal education—stuff so crude, so inconsistent, so feeble, that even a writer in the *Daily Herald* felt compelled to denounce it. The moral is—support the Catholic Social Guild, especially in its gallant enterprise at Oxford, the Catholic Labour College. Our generation is ignorant and misguided, not generally because error is preferred to truth, but because truth is not known. The poor have not had the Gospel effectively preached to them.

**Federation of
Catholic University
Societies.**

We rejoice to learn from *The Inter-University Magazine* for January, an exceptionally interesting number, that: "At last the Federation exists. All the Catholic societies in our Universities and University Colleges have signified their assent to the final draft of the Constitutions which we circulated." The movement for uniting these various groups of Catholics of University standing was formally inaugurated at the Liverpool Congress of 1920, and has been kept alive and in progress by the continued publication of the *Magazine* and the infectious energies of its Editor, Father Martindale. The object of the Federa-

tion is "to assist the formation of an educated Catholic opinion in matters of social, intellectual and political importance in relation to Catholic teaching"—a public opinion which, if it is to be created and fostered, demands a certain amount of intercourse. The several societies in each educational centre are of immense value in preventing Catholics and what they stand for from being submerged in the preponderant non-Catholic mass around them. This further step in the same direction will clearly produce the same effect in an enhanced degree. University men and women can by voice and pen do much to advance Catholic truth in this country. They should be conspicuous supporters of the C.E.G. and aid the C.T.S. in correcting the errors concerning Catholic faith and practice which still abound in literature and the press.

Apologetic Handbooks.

Father Martindale in the same issue outlines a scheme for a series of Apologetic Handbooks, which has long been a crying need. The more one realizes the extremely reasonable character of Catholic teaching, even when concerned with what is supernatural or beyond reason, the greater is one's longing to bring it home to the non-Catholic multitude, minds naturally equipped for the acquisition of truth. Father Martindale does not ignore the existence of useful Apologetic works, Explanations of Catholic Doctrine, etc., but for the purpose in view they are too general. What is wanted for students and inquirers are expositions of particular topics, something intermediate between the C.T.S. tract and the extended treatment of the book, fuller than the space of a pamphlet allows, more concise and to the point than is provided by a set treatise. They should be from 48 to 64 pages in length, and contain: (1) a clear statement of the problem or topic in question, (2) a clear statement of Catholic doctrine concerning it, (3) an explanation of the exact implications of the doctrine, (4) a fair description of the rival doctrine or doctrines, (5) a summing-up, (6) a bibliography. It will be remembered that the C.T.S. is busily engaged in an organized production of pamphlets to fill up the gaps in its lists and round off its explanation and defence of Catholic Truth. There seems no reason why the two enterprises should not be pursued together, why the C.T.S. writers should not have in view an expansion or recasting of their several topics to suit a more specialized audience

Doctrinal Agreement in Anglicanism.

We read in *The Times* for February 21st that the Bishop of Oxford, on behalf of twenty-seven signatories including nine Bishops, sent a memorial to the Archbishop of Canterbury suggesting "the appointment of a commission to endeavour to

find a basis of doctrinal agreement on matters which are the subject of controversy between different sections of the Church of England." Considering that these matters concern the very fundamentals of the faith, that history records the failure of many other efforts to secure unity of doctrine in Anglicanism, we cannot but admire the unwearied patience and hope of these zealous men in seeking after an ideal which the Church Catholic achieved on the day of Pentecost and has retained ever since. It is pathetic, in view of historical experience, to read of their belief that "an inquiry animated by nothing but the desire to arrive at the truth would ultimately reveal that the matters on which agreement was impossible were those on which differences of opinion are obviously legitimate and even, within certain limits, desirable." Was there ever a belief so blind, so unfounded, so much the creature of desire? What possible basis for agreement on matters of revelation, matters in themselves or in their implications beyond the scrutiny and test of reason, can there be except a prophet's voice proclaiming: "Thus saith the Lord," or (the New Testament equivalent), "It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us"—in other words, a living visible and audible authority? Without such guidance, zeal for the truth is apt to produce the very opposite effect, to emphasize differences, to stress the personal equation, for reason alone can never provide a fixed and final criterion of truth, even in things within its scope. The Archbishop of Canterbury showed his usual common sense in shelving the suggestion, on the plea that it was too vague, and that he did not know what men he could find to sit on such a commission, or "what character or authority would belong to such 'expression of the Church's official teaching' when ultimately produced." The Church of England has thus rejected once more any claim to teach with authority.

Meanwhile, the hungry sheep, represented by the Dean of Durham,¹ are crying out for "some official guidance in the matter of orthodoxy," and are anxious to know whether in the collective judgment of the Episcopal Bench, "Modernism . . . is compatible with the Catholic faith of the Church." We venture to think that his reasonable plea will also be disregarded. The Episcopal Bench dare not condemn Modernism. And Mr. Major, whom the Bishop of Oxford refuses to declare a heretic, is emboldened to suggest² that the Prayer Book should contain three "uses," to meet the desires of Anglo-Catholics, Evangelicals and Modern Churchmen respectively. Since the *lex orandi* is an expression of the *lex credendi*, it would be interesting to compare the three creeds whereon these "uses" would be based.

¹ *Times*, Feb. 14, 1922.

² *Times*, Jan. 30, 1922

**Birth-Control
Propaganda.**

There is no apparent slackening in the campaign against the Christian ideal of marriage and the family, which goes by the euphemistic name of the Birth Control Movement. Like the red revolutionaries that masquerade as "Labour," the members of this body are few in number but pursue their pernicious propaganda with a zeal which is in itself admirable and with a subtlety which is diabolical. Purely destructive of Christian morality as are their methods, they emphasize the constructive character of their object as if it were theirs alone and not common to all decent reformers. What Christian social worker is there that does not wish to build up a sound civilization on a healthy home life, that does not desire for children all the care and discipline necessary for the training of character? With that motive we aim at the destruction of slums, sweated labour, destitution and all the influences in modern industry that tend to injure health and to prevent due mental and moral development. But we do not suggest, nay, we reject and denounce as intrinsically evil, the immoral methods advocated by the Birth Controllers. Our reasons, which are based not only on morality but on medical science, on the teaching of history, on social welfare, may be read in an admirable treatise just published, to which we cannot do more than refer here, pending a fuller notice. It is called *Birth Control: a Statement of Christian Doctrine against the Neo-Malthusians* (Harding and More: 6s.), and is written by a well-known medical authority, Halliday G. Sutherland, M.D. (Edin.). We trust that it will be widely circulated for, once the guidance of Christian morality is thrown aside, material civilization will not prevent society from sinking into depths of immorality unknown even to the pagan. As a sample, we are told, on the authority of *The Catholic Citizen* (February 15th) that in Uganda measures resembling the notorious C.D. acts have been widely introduced, and a Catholic lady doctor summarily dismissed for refusing to countenance them.

**Why tolerate
Fog?**

Only the artist and the thinker know how much of the beauty and joy of life is sacrificed to the cult of money-making. Mammon-worship, even pursued with moderation, always tends to make its votaries miss higher values whilst seeking lower—*propter vitam, vivendi perdere causas*. It is money-making or money saving that is responsible for the dirt and ugliness of centres of manufacture, for hideous dwellings and factories and railway surroundings, for noise and blatant advertisement. After centuries of civilization we are worse off now than our ancestors in these respects. Money has always been allowed to have the first and final say, its interests have been paramount, and art and beauty have been thrust aside. In nothing has this blindness

to true worth been more apparent than in the modern tolerance of smoke. Smoke in London, for instance, supervening on a river-mist causes a fog which is exceedingly injurious, not only to the health and cleanliness of its inhabitants and to their material possessions, but also paradoxically enough to that process of money-getting itself which is the chief obstacle to its removal. Scientific men have demonstrated in detail the harm done to life and property not only by fogs in misty weather, but also by the soot suspended in the air on clear days or descending in the parachutes of the rain; devices have been invented to secure the entire combustion of fuel, but the community remains persistently penny-wise and pound-foolish. When a reform is urgently needed and constantly blocked, the reason is generally to be sought in "vested interests": it is to the financial profit of some class or group to maintain the abuse. But in this case, when all would benefit by improved methods of burning fuel or by preparing fuel for burning, it is hard to see why a victimized populace tolerates an abuse of this magnitude. In the Report of Lord Newton's Committee on Smoke Abatement, we read that the German industrial towns are comparatively free from the nuisance, because the Government insists on the use of smoke-consuming devices, and is supported, if not inspired, by public opinion.

The Law against Blasphemy. A certain scurrilous writer, whose pornographic literature the *Daily Herald* is not ashamed to advertise, was imprisoned the other day under the blasphemy laws, to the great indignation of those who think that unless "a man may speak the thing he will" he has lost an essential part of his liberty. The Christian recognizes no such freedom: speech no less than act and thought is controlled by the moral law. Yes, but supposing his utterance has the approval of his conscience? Then public order and the rights of others form an external check. We are quite prepared to grant that the State has no jurisdiction over religious opinions as such, but only if their expression tends to upset public order, to lead to a breach of the peace. The Judge who tried the case thought that these vile publications had that natural tendency, and so he sentenced the criminal, not to vindicate God's honour, but to safeguard public decency. It is true, as the complainants urged, that many distinguished writers are guilty of blasphemy, but that is not the point. They do not take their evil wares into the street and peddle them to the passer-by, and affront by their insulting treatment of the Christian faith the feelings of many of their fellow-citizens. Certainly, it is not the business of the State as such to decide what constitutes the sin of blasphemy, but it can and should determine when public order has been wantonly disturbed.

THE EDITOR.

III. NOTES ON THE PRESS

[A summary survey of current periodicals with a view to recording useful articles which 1) expound Catholic doctrine and practice, 2) expose heresy and bigotry, and 3) are of general Catholic interest.]

CATHOLIC DOCTRINE AND PRACTICE.

Darwinism, Prof. de Dorlodot on [C. C. Martindale, S.J., in *Inter-University Magazine*, Jan. 1922, p. 118].

Resurrection of the Body: Catholic Doctrine [*Universe*, Feb. 24, 1922, p. 10].

CATHOLIC DEFENCE.

Apologetic Handbooks, Scheme for [C. C. Martindale, S.J., in *Inter-University Magazine*, Jan., 1922, p. 86].

Gore, Bishop: Appreciation of his *Belief in God* [V. McNabb, O.P., in *Blackfriars*, Feb., 1922, p. 643].

Pascal and the Jesuits [J. C. Reville, S.J., in *America*, Jan. 21, 1922, p. 330].

POINTS OF CATHOLIC INTEREST.

Benedict XV.: his work for the Church [Y. de la Brière in *Etudes*, Feb. 5, 1922, p. 257; J. C. Reville, S.J., in *America*, Jan. 28, 1922, p. 337].

Bible, The Question of the Vulgate [C. Lattey in *Catholic World*, Feb. 1922, p. 641].

Peace: The First International Democratic Congress [A. J. Muench in *America*, Jan. 21, 1922, p. 317]; Results of ignoring the Papacy [W. F. Markoe in *America*, Feb. 4, 1922, p. 367].

Pope, Coronation of [H. Thurston, S.J., in *MONTH*, March, 1922, p. 197].

Washington Conference, Achievements of [*America*, Jan. 21, Feb. 11, 1922, pp. 322, 386].

Zahm, The Life-work of Father [Fr. Cavanaugh in *Catholic World*, Feb., 1922, p. 577].

REVIEWS

I—TWO JESUIT HISTORIES¹

ON March 12, 1622, Pope Gregory XV. pronounced in favour of the canonization of St. Ignatius. But Gregory's death, which followed soon after, postponed not only the great public ceremonial, but also the issue of the Bull, which was eventually expedited by Urban VIII., his successor, on August 6, 1623, with the clause that it was to take effect from the March 12th before mentioned. The history of a great religious body is to a large extent the history of its Founder whose spirit it incorporates, and we may take occasion to commemorate, in noticing the volumes before us, the tercentenary of St. Ignatius's canonization, which occurs on the twelfth of this month.

Father Campbell's volume, running to nearly a thousand pages, essays an enormous task—for which it is none too long—to give a rapid survey of the world-wide activities of the Jesuits during nearly four centuries, activities which were not merely world-wide, but which entered deep into many a vital controversy, the discussion of which became so intricate and animated that no other solution was possible in their day than the imposition of silence on both sides. There is much virtue in rapid sketching, and in the hand of a master it produces telling effects, which none the less are true. But humanly speaking, all virtues are accompanied by their defects, and the characteristic defect of rapid sketching is the presence of numerous minute errors. Father Campbell's sketch is not free from these, though so far as we have noticed they are on quite a small scale, occurring, that is, in names, in comparisons, in the use of negative statements and the like, which are so hard to handle faultlessly. We hasten to add that in the really more difficult topics, such as religious controversies, these imperfections seem to decrease, a sign that greater care has been employed. But even so, the light and

¹(1) *The Jesuits, 1534—1921. A history of the Society of Jesus from its Foundation to the Present Time.* By Thomas J. Campbell, S.J. New York: Catholic Encyclopedia Press. Pp. xvi. 930. Price, 25s. net.

(2) *Storia della Compagnia di Gesù in Italia.* Vol. II. Dal P. Pietro Tacchi Venturi. Rome: *Civiltà Cattolica*. Pp. lxvii. 422. Price, lire 50.

easy way in which the gravest problems are settled is not altogether reassuring. The book, however, does not claim to be a work of reference, but a readable yet authoritative survey of a great subject.

Father Campbell claims credit for having brought his book down to our own day, and he deserves it. His vigorous and vivid style and his broad generalizations bring out well the ever-changing difficulties and successes of the Jesuit missionary in the distant spheres of India, South Africa and Alaska, as also the varied fortunes of the Society during the great war. Everywhere there breathes a strong common sense and an outspoken confidence, racy of the soil, that the ideals of the Order will prove themselves as helpful for good in the future as they have done in the past. Catholics should secure that this handy volume is put in public libraries where, generally speaking, there is plenty of poison to which it would serve as an antidote.

Father T. Venturi's work deals with the fortunes of the Society in Italy. This second volume will give lively satisfaction to all who know and love the historic Catholicity of that land, from its frontispiece, an excellent portrait of Ignatius, to its conclusion, the interesting new documents in the appendix. When we say that there is much in this volume which we have heard before, we may seem at first to be depreciating its value. But first, it is obvious that it would utterly emasculate a history of the Jesuits in Italy, if the doings of St. Ignatius their founder (the matter of which we have heard before) had been omitted. Moreover, the *Gesta Ignatii* are now recounted with so great and unsuspected a luxury of local detail and subsidiary information that the story comes out with new and unexpected vividness and charm. Padre Venturi's narrative is in fact everywhere brilliant; vivid without rhetoric; detailed yet never lagging. Ecclesiastical and local history is ever under his hand. The number of MS. records he cites is enormous, and always with the facility of the true historical *virtuoso*. References are never wanting, yet never obtrude themselves.

By far the greater part of the book relates to Italy outside Rome, and the first labours of the early Jesuits (so far generally called *Prete riformati*) in the field of home missions from Naples in the south to Brescia in the north. But it would be mere confusion to attempt a summary of their adventures in detail. It will be better to confine ourselves to

the achievement of one of the youngest of the body. Francis Strada, the future preacher, was as yet only a year or so over twenty, and he joined Ignatius scarce two months earlier, and had not yet received any of the higher orders when he found himself, as part of his probation, working alone in Montepulciano. The passage which we cite has been very much condensed.

"At first Francesco did no more than hold pious conversations with individuals, but before long a large church was needed for those who came to hear. The plan of his discourses was very simple, and one which reflected indirectly on the sad disuse into which the frequentation of the sacraments had fallen in those days. It was merely a month's preparation before receiving the sacraments, and at the end he was doubtful how many would present themselves. In fact, however, numbers of people, headed by the two principal officials of the municipality, came to Communion, and then it was clear that the reformation of the town was well begun. This was not due merely to Strada's eloquence, but still more to his inspiring example. His quests for the poor required no little heroism in those whom he won to good works. He first assembled his *poveri derelitti* in one long and motley procession, which sang hymns as it wound its way through the town (the present reviewer has seen similar processions at Fiesole only twenty years ago). Strada, with his followers (amongst whom are specially mentioned "four conspicuous LL.D.'s"), went at its head, knocking at the doors as they passed, and pleading with the householders for alms. Offerings of all sorts, both in kind and in money, were soon made, and carried off to the church steps by the poor, where other followers of Strada divided it among the destitute" (pp. 234—237).

No wonder the *cittadini* were charmed with their young and apostolic organizer, and that when Father Ignatius recalled him they appealed to the Pope, and got him to stop on for another three months, the orders for which extension of leave have been discovered by our author. Thus on every side did the work of reform go on humbly but effectively, until in fifty years the face of the country was changed. But in the volume before us we only follow the reform for its first decade.

2—THE LAST WORD ON LORETO¹

IT would be hard to exaggerate the service which Canon Chevalier rendered to the cause of honest historical criticism within the Catholic Church when he courageously published in 1906 his epoch-making volume, *Notre-Dame de Loretto*. As we have previously had occasion to point out in these pages (see THE MONTH, January, 1912, p. 89), the thesis defended by him has won the assent of almost every periodical in France, Germany and Belgium which can claim to be regarded as scholarly and scientific. Still no careful reader of Canon Chevalier's book would be tempted to regard his treatment of the subject as exhaustive. Moreover, as must almost inevitably happen when pioneer work is being done, there were slips here and there. Canon Chevalier's great merit is that he did not quail before the disfavour which such criticism was bound to encounter in many influential quarters, and that he laid down clearly and convincingly the broad lines upon which such an inquiry must always be conducted. Relatively, the work of those who come after him is easier, but where this work is able and conscientiously performed, links in the chain of argument are better tested, more carefully welded together and more skilfully disposed, with the consequence that the whole train of reasoning is more overwhelmingly conclusive.

Professor Georg Hüffer, in the painstaking study which after many years of preparation he has now brought to completion, sets in the first place an admirable example of logical and lucid method. Rarely have we come across a controversial discussion of any historical problem which could be read with so little effort. We say a controversial discussion, though it is one of the outstanding merits of both volumes that, in marked contrast to such a work as that, for example, of Father Rinieri on the same subject, we are not irritated at every turn by polemical outbursts and inuendos. Dr. Hüffer presents us with a calm, dispassionate statement of the facts, and by the aid of judicious summaries and recapitulations he makes the bearing of each section upon the whole argument admirably clear. He has of necessity to meet the objections of opponents, but if we have to regret

¹ *Loreto, Eine geschichts-kritische Untersuchung der Frage des Heiligen Hauses*. Von Professor Dr. Georg Hüffer. 2 Vols., pp. 288—206. Aschendorff, Münster i. W., 1913—1921. Price, 48 marks.

that even in his case a certain acrimony of tone sometimes makes itself apparent, still we do not carry away the impression of incessant carping which marks so many other books on the subject.

So far as regards the broad features of his argument, Dr. Hüffer, almost of necessity, follows the lines laid down by Chevalier. His first volume, published in 1913, is devoted to an examination of the Western evidence. The second, which could not be printed until after the war, and is dated 1921, is concerned mainly with the traditional site of the Holy House at Nazareth; but Dr. Hüffer has turned the postponement of the issue of his book to advantage, by incorporating in it an appendix of 30 pages in reply to the critics of the first instalment. In this answer he seems to vindicate quite successfully against Father Rinieri and Professor Kresser the important inferences he had previously drawn from the *Urkunden* of 1194 and 1285. It seems to us to be established with all reasonable certainty that a shrine of Our Lady had already existed at Loreto for a century or more before the date of the supposed aerial translation. At the same time, it cannot for a moment be pretended that the attack upon the trustworthiness of the received legend must stand or fall by the verdict ultimately pronounced upon these corruptly transmitted early documents. In view of the extreme intrinsic improbability of the miracle in itself, and the complete absence of any direct testimony to such a marvel for nearly two hundred years after its supposed occurrence, it would seem to us that almost any one of the other contentions of the adverse party if the attack is successfully pressed home—and Dr. Hüffer has in every case, we think, substantially proved his point—would be sufficient by itself to incline the balance irresistibly to the negative side. Nowhere has the author been more convincing than in his utter demolition of the preposterous document of Teramano. It is out of this that the whole legend has sprung and he has done wisely to put it in the forefront of his exposition of the case.

In the second volume of his work Professor Hüffer is able to make use of a good deal of material which was not available when Chevalier wrote more than fifteen years ago. A thorough examination of the remains of the basilica of the Annunciation at Nazareth has been undertaken by the Franciscan Guardian, Father Prosper Viand, the complete results

of which were only published in 1910. By the aid of these researches as well as a more complete study of the narratives of pilgrims, our author has been able to demonstrate how impossible it is that such a building as the little rectangular chapel now standing at Loreto should have been detached from the cave at Nazareth which was the traditional residence of the Holy Family, and was there visited by pilgrims throughout the Middle Ages. The work before us is further equipped with some excellent plans and photographs and with some valuable information regarding the stone of which the Holy House is constructed. We can only hope that this admirable and exhaustive work will become widely known. No competent and unprejudiced scholar who makes acquaintance with it can resist the force of the arguments which are here so admirably marshalled and on the whole so temperately urged.

3—OLD WINE IN NEW BOTTLES¹

TRADITION is apt to be expressed in a traditional way: the "form of sound words" tends to become stereotyped; theological science, so necessary to break up the revelation of the Infinite into morsels digestible by finite minds, may get into grooves which unduly limit investigation. Consequently, when new text-books of theology are published one's first inquiry is—how far are they new? Do they simply repeat in different type and arrangement what has been said before, or do they also aim at applying established principles to the solution of modern problems? For the world of mind is subject to alteration just as are the worlds of industry and politics, and current theology must be modern if it is to be useful, must in fact reverse the procedure of the modernists, and, instead of "recasting the creeds" in deference to modern speculation, constantly test modern speculation by the truth of the creeds. The Church has a standard, divine and immutable, by which to direct and regulate the constant strivings of the human spirit towards the Infinite, and it behoves her theologians to apply that standard to the thought of their own times.

For this reason we accord a hearty welcome to the two

¹ (1) *Institutiones Theologiae Naturalis ad usum Scholarum accommodatae*. Auctore G. J. Brosnan, S.J. Pp. x. 396. Price, \$3.50. (2) *Apologetica quam in usum Auditorum suorum concinnavit* J. T. Langan, S.J. Pp. xii. 434. Price, \$3.50. both published by Loyola University Press: Chicago.

volumes under review, the work of American theologians fully alive to the needs of the times. Their text-books are scholastic in form, for no more deadly instrument for rending the veil of sophistry and exposing other abuses of reason could be devised than that product of pure reason, the logic of the schools. With this weapon they fight, not as beating the air, but getting it home on the persons of that large tribe of learned irrationalists, who, breaking from the Church's guidance and tradition, are consequently floundering in the morass of private judgment.

Father Brosnan's theme is God Knowable by Reason, the development of St. Paul's assertion of the fact, made a dogma by the Vatican Council. The novelty of his treatment does not consist in his discovering new rational grounds for establishing God's Existence and Attributes, but in his arraying against each of his thirty-one theses lengthy quotations in English of the views of modern adversaries, so that the student knows what to expect when he comes to apply his knowledge, what a foggy, perverted, inconsistent thing, for all its zeal and learning, is the modern mind which he has to confront. He can see here that the real foe of religion is not the atheist but Kant, whose scepticism has debauched human reason outside the Church. That is a discipline missing from many of the old text-books which attacked dead and forgotten heretics, but paid little heed to the living and still active, and on that account alone this treatise merits the heartiest of welcomes. But in other respects also it is a model. The Latin is clear, the propositions definite, the syllogisms short and aptly framed, the difficulties fairly faced and adequately answered. And to every thesis is attached a wealth of bibliographical matter drawn from modern orthodox sources, with corresponding references to the opinions of living opponents which immensely increases the utility of the book. Add to this, in the case of both volumes, a striking variety of type, a wide and handsome page, and a serviceable binding, and the result is seen to be one which is a credit both to its author and to the great University which publishes it.

In his "*Apologetica*" Father Langan has a subject of much wider scope, the philosophical, critical and historical defence of Revelation and of Christ the Revealer, which is the very battle-ground whereon we have to meet the Naturalism of the day. He deals with the foundations of theology

establishing first that revelation is possible and has occurred, then that its records are trustworthy and, finally, that Jesus Christ is the Messiah and the Son of God. Into this framework are introduced a number of questions of the greatest importance,—the apologetic value of miracles, the historicity of the New Testament, the claims and character of Christ, "other gospels," pre-Christian world-religions, and all that goes to make the Christian religion credible. As in Father Brosnan's book, the attitude of the "modern mind," especially as regards the Bible, is everywhere faced and considered, and the treatise is a genuine storehouse of answers to modern difficulties concerning fundamentals. In this case the bibliography divided into *auctores Catholici* and *a-Catholici* runs to over sixty pages, printed at the end of the book but distributed according to theses, which immensely enhances its value as a work of reference. Both books have excellent indexes.

4—TUDOR CHURCH MUSIC¹

IT is to be hoped that those who are responsible for the music in our churches will carefully watch these issues of Tudor Church Music by the Carnegie Trust. They are cheap (in price) and can be easily obtained from Messrs. Stainer and Bell, 58, Berners Street, London, W. 1. The Reformation made no practical difference artistically to composers of this period. Obviously during the full flush of the movement the works of composers were not performed, but their composition went on all the same. Unfortunately, during the suppression of the monasteries a great deal of music was scattered and destroyed. It was very rare in any case to find a book containing all the parts. Each voice had but its own part, and these separate books have been found up and down the country in Anglican Cathedral Libraries, University Libraries, and private collections. Very little of this music was printed, and the difficulties of piecing together the various parts, the changes in idiom and notation which appeared during the seventeenth century, the influence of fashion, and the over-readiness of our eighteenth-century ancestors to import their music from abroad, has caused great neglect of this wealth of genius and skill and invention for

¹ The "Leroy" Kyrie (Taverner, 6d.), *Audivi vocem de Coelo* (Tallis, 6d.), *Ave Verum Corpus* (Byrd, 6d.), *Sacerdotes Domini* (Byrd, 3d.), *Ascendit Deus* (Phillips, 9d.). All issued by Oxford University Press, London.

over three hundred years. The Tudor Period was, as we know, famous for its poets and dramatists; it is natural, therefore, that it should also have excelled in music.

Amongst the pre-Reformation composers whose works will appear under this scheme are Taverner (c 1495—1540), Tallis (d. 1585), White (d. 1574), Aston (1480?—1522). The post-Reformation composers, also to be published, Byrd, Gibbons, Weelkes, reached ripeness of mentality too soon after the change of religion to be affected in their compositions. They all breathe the true Catholic spirit: the spirit of divine contentment, prayer and praise.

One cannot well discriminate between the publications just to hand. They are all so good. The editors have given every possible assistance in marks for rendering. The approximate metronome mark has been given and will obviate that unfortunate misconception, "That because a piece belongs to a bygone age, it must be taken slowly." *No!* Live in these works while you sing them, and sing them as if you meant it. Remember that every beautiful expression is bound to bear fruit for good. By the choice of what is good you will be restoring music to the dignity of the handmaid of religion, and rescuing it from the degradation it often suffers even in our churches.

SHORT NOTICES.

THEOLOGY.

THE well-known author of the *History of Dogma*, M. l'Abbé J. Tixeront, has turned his extensive knowledge of Positive Theology to good account in writing a **Handbook of Patrology** (Herder: 12s. 6d. net), which has already gone through four editions in French. A Patrology of some sort is of course indispensable to the theological student, and Professor Tixeront's, though less full of detail than Bardenheuer's, should satisfy most requirements. It is abundantly documented.

An almost inexhaustible store of matter for sermons is provided in the large 4-volume series called **A Parochial Course of Doctrinal Instructions** for all Sundays and Holy-days of the Year (Herder: 16s. per volume), prepared and arranged by Fathers Callan and McHugh, O.P., of which the second and third volume are before us. The scheme of instructions is based upon the authoritative Catechism of the Council of Trent harmonized with the recurring Sunday Gospels and Epistles, and is so ordered that all dogmatic subjects shall be dealt with in the course of one year and all questions of moral during the second. The volumes are divided accordingly—the first two being devoted to dogma and the last two to moral. The combination of the text of the Catechism, with

clear outlines of each subject and model discourses on each by well-known preachers, provides a wealth of material, but in addition there is a large and varied bibliography referring to standard Catholic works appended to each discourse. A production of immense pains and corresponding utility.

Aptly enough, considering the current modernist controversy, appears that section of the Third Part (Supplement) of St. Thomas' *Summa Theologica* (B.O. and W.: 12s.), which deals with the Resurrection of the Body, translated by Dominican Fathers of the English Province. The reader may contemplate here, set forth with the lucidity and fulness which characterize the *Summa*, the traditional doctrine of the Church which no scientific discoveries can ever weaken or upset, for although sometimes the science of the treatise is far to seek, this defect does not touch its accurate expression of the Christian Tradition.

CANON LAW.

In a volume of a hundred and fifty pages, *Religieux et Religieuses d'après le Droit Ecclésiastique* (Beauchesne: 2.00 fr.), Father Creusen, S.J., has succeeded in explaining accurately, and in language which all can comprehend, those canons of the Code which deal with religious men and women. The arrangement, printing and tabulation leave nothing to be desired, smaller type being used for the author's commentary, which is no mere academic or legalist commentary on Canons 487-681. The author is familiar with the every-day details of religious life, and keeps these always in mind. But the preface warns us that he is not writing a treatise on the religious state, which is something higher than could be gathered from the laws controlling it: for these must of necessity deal with the external safeguards established by the Church in order to make possible the inner life of the Religious. The government and ministerial work of a religious community are treated of, the noviceship, vows, duties, and privileges of Religious are all discussed, and the final part deals with departure and dismissal from the Institute. Father Creusen appears to be writing particularly, but by no means entirely, for communities of nuns, and we hope that every Religious superior and community will have the book at hand for reference and instruction. Amid much that is good, we would single out the chapter on the confessions of Religious as specially valuable, but in one point regarding the validity of a confession made in virtue of the liberty given by Canon 522, he seems neither clear nor consistent. However, since the Commission, in its interpretation of this canon, has made everything quite plain, the point is of minor importance.

In *De Tempore* (Marietti: 2.75 fr.) Father Joannes Lacau, S.C.I., prints a dissertation which he somewhat pretentiously styles "Philosophico-Scientifico-Juridica." The chief merit of the work is that he collects into one fascicle the chief canons of the Codex dealing with "Time" without venturing into too detailed a commentary on them. The author shows clearly the distinction between true solar, mean time and legal time and how these different computations of time are arrived at. The metaphysical section is not of such practical utility that it could not afford to be omitted.

DEVOTIONAL.

The uncompromising nature of the old asceticism which lived in awe of God's majesty, thought Heaven worth any sacrifice, and appre-

ciated the enormity of sin, breathes through the *Considerations on Eternity* (Herder: 7s.6d. n.), written in Latin by Father Jerome Drexelius many generations ago, and now newly translated by Sister M. J. Byrne. The old Jesuit's science may be out-of-date, and his illustrations and examples provoke a smile, but his ascetical counsel is sound, barring his easy acquiescence, once so widely accepted in the Church, in what he calls "the incredible number of the damned." But be they many or few, there is no doubt that we shall be amongst them—and this is the sum of his message—if we knowingly persist in disobeying God in grave matters.

Efficiency in business is taught as a science in the United States, and it struck Sister M. Cecilia of Paola, Kansas, that the common-sense methods tested by experience inculcated in the efficiency-course might well be applied to the business of soul-saving. This is the genesis of her striking little book, *Efficiency in the Spiritual Life* (Herder: 7s. 6d.), which shows in detail that proper business-methods produce a wonderful effect in the cultivation of the soul. It is a practical adaption of means to end, and presupposes that the end is really and steadfastly desired. It will be found of much interest by Religious, and indeed by all who are in earnest about their salvation.

Those who have read *A Wife's Story*, which was the spiritual diary of Madame Elizabeth Leseur discovered, after her death and the reading of which converted an infidel husband, will be glad to see *The Spiritual Life* (B.O. and W.: 6s. net), compiled by that same husband from his wife's writings, and translated from the French by A. M. Buchanan. It reveals yet more completely the sound and solid piety of Madame Leseur, and the apostolate she was inspired to exercise by her writings. In an introductory chapter her husband, now on the eve, according to her prediction, of becoming a Dominican, describes the character of the letters, notes, etc., of which he has made use: nearly half the book consists of a "Memoir" of her sister, written by his wife, but never before given to the world.

Dr. A. J. Mason has given us in *Fifty Spiritual Homilies of St. Macarius the Egyptian* (S.P.C.K.: 15s. net) a pleasant and scholarly translation—with an introduction on St. Macarius and his teaching—of the only extant work of this famous ascetic of the fourth century. The author was a Copt who retired into the desert at the age of thirty, about 330 A.D., and spent there the remaining sixty years of his life. He speedily achieved a great reputation for sanctity and discernment and became an abbot. These homilies are conferences which he gave to the brethren or discussions in which he replied to their questions. He deals with the various aspects of virtue and the ascetical life in a very concrete manner, abundantly illustrating his explanations by analogies drawn from their daily experience. Consequently there is a vigour and freshness about the homilies that makes them inspiring spiritual reading, even at the present day.

BIOGRAPHY.

A valuable addition to the Series *Catholic Thought and Thinkers* appears in the life of *Erasmus of Rotterdam* (Harding and More: 5s. net) by Maurice Wilkinson. Erasmus was by nature and education a moderate at a time when the religious world was very sharply divided into Catholics and Reformers. He could see the Church needed reform

and also that the Reformers were going the wrong way about their enterprise. Hence he is quoted by both sides in support of either position. Mr. Wilkinson succeeds in showing how sound in substance was his Catholicism, although his caustic criticism of abuses laid him open to the charge of siding with the iconoclasts.

HISTORY.

Miss Lina Eckenstein, in *A History of Sinai* (S.P.C.K.: 8s. 6d. net), gives a very comprehensive sketch of the peninsula. Starting as she does, away back in the early Egyptian days of Pharaoh Semerkhet, her account at first is largely a matter of conjecture. There are monuments to guide—in excavating which the authoress has herself taken part—but the evidence is not yet enough to elevate surmise into fact. One learns to distrust the indications of Moon worship which Miss Eckenstein, like so many others, finds. It is so easy to carry conjecture one step further and find, in the Religion of the Bible, a development from the worship of Thoth, in much the same way as the authoress airily says: "The Virgin Mary took the place of local mother-divinities in Europe." Towards the end of the book the history tends to confine itself to the record of the famous Convent of St. Katherine. The book is suitably illustrated.

HAGIOGRAPHY.

To write two biographies in the space of two hundred small pages has been one of Father Martindale's latest feats. The result is two lightning sketches of *Marie Thérèse de Soubirau* (Foundress of the Society of Marie Auxiliatrice) and of *Marie Elizabeth de Luppé*, her eldest spiritual daughter (B.O. and W.: 2s. 6d. net). Father Martindale's gift for this kind of character sketching is well known. In this "Household of God" series, he has already drawn *Mère Thérèse Couderc*, Foundress of the Cenacle, and to this he adds in the present volume two more drawings of "saints" of only yesterday, and the family likeness is apparent. This latter is also a book to ponder. It should be read especially by those who believe that "heroic" sanctity died when "nerves" came into existence.

VERSE.

Mother St. Jerome, of the Convent of the Retreat of the Sacred Heart, Bruges, has collected in *Where He Listeth* (price 2s. 6d., from the Author) some more of her fresh, devotional verse, not a little of which our readers have already appreciated. She holds a high place of her own amongst the singers of the cloister, who are growing in number and skill in these latter days.

A book of French verse of a religious cast, *Vers la Maison du Père* (La Revue des Jeunes: 7.00 fr.), by René Salomé, will interest our younger bards. The verses are fresh and spirited. "Les Petites Eglises" is especially good, and the last poem, "Vous que j'aime," ends the book with a very fine chord. We wish the young poet all success.

From far Australia comes *Around the Boree Log, and Other Verses* (Angus and Robertson: 6s. net), by "John O'Brien," which brings to our unaccustomed senses the flavour of Catholic Ireland beyond the seas in a setting of sheep-runs and "stations." We welcome this book of sturdy, swinging verse, redolent of the beauty of both worlds, and admire the "Little Mother" and "Father Pat," whose characters adorn it.

Few books or pamphlets, published in aid of some charity, can be praised for more than their *raison d'être*. **The Star-dusty Road** (pp. 24: price 2s.), the first of *The Hope Series* by Father T. Gavan-Duffy is rather exceptional in this respect. Artless to a fault, this booklet of verse is yet worthy of careful reading. The poems, inspired by real feeling, rise far above the level of mere metrical exercises. We wish the "Hope" Series the success that this forerunner promises and that the missionary enterprise which it benefits deserves.

Another booklet of the series recounts the travels of the missionary round the world in his perennial quest for funds. **Fifteen Thousand Miles of Doggerel** is the depreciatory title Father Gavan-Duffy gives to his charming little Kodak-and-verse descriptions of his tour. The lines may sometimes be halting, but the mind behind them burns with the fire of truth, and depicts both men and nature with shrewd yet kindly force.

SOCIAL QUESTIONS.

Father Joseph Husslein returns in a smaller volume, **Work, Wealth and Wages** (Herder: 5s.), to a theme which he has already elaborated in his "Democratic Industry" and "The World Problem," and, after summarizing the conclusions arrived at, develops at greater length the Catholic remedies for current evils—the better and fuller distribution of the means and profits of production by co-operation and co-partnership. The second part of the book shows how democracy can be Christianized. The book would do admirably for study-circles.

Père Valère Fallon, S.J., is favourably known to economists from his exhaustive study of Unearned Increment, called *Le Plus-Values et l'Impôt* and published about a year before the war. Now he has attempted with a like success a much more ambitious work—**Principes d'Economie Sociale** (Bomans: 8.00 fr.)—treating of the subject as a whole. It is a work that has stood the test of criticism, being the result of the author's lectures during many years at the Philosophic College at Louvain and at the Liège School of Technique. Hence it is characterized by both fullness and clearness, and has the appearance of having been thoroughly investigated and discussed. It follows the usual order of treatises on economics—production, distribution, consumption, etc.—and like our own classic Devas never fails to suggest adequate remedies for the abuses with which modern industry abounds, and correctives of the false theories which have led to them. Père Fallon has read very widely and provides a formidable bibliography for each section: we do not, however, see any references to the important school of American Catholic economists. In the treatment of usury, no direct account is taken of the modern view, which has affected even some Catholics, that all exaction of interest is unlawful, and that industry should be organized not for profit but for service.

The treatise, now in its fourth edition, on **L'Enseignement social de Jésus** (Procure Générale: 6.00 fr.), of which the Abbé A. Lugan is the author, is not a text-book, but aims at showing that Gospel principles carry the solution of social problems. The teaching of our Lord regarding the Individual, the Family and the State would result, if acted on, in the perfection of all three. The subject is not new, but is well illustrated by modern instances.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Conveyed through the not very convincing medium of a series of letters to a female relative, the Rev. C. J. Holland's essay on the priestly character, called **His Reverence: His Day's Work** (Blaise Benziger and Co.: \$1.50), covers all the trials, dangers and consolations of the life of a pastor of souls on a busy mission, showing how and where a priest necessarily differs in aim and practice from other men.

The second annual issue of **The Jesuit Directory and Year Book** (Griffiths and Co.: 1s. n.), that for 1922, is an improvement in many ways on its pioneer predecessor, and presents even more fully all information about the English Province of the Society and its many activities that is of interest to the public. There are several new features, notably a history of The Sodality of the Blessed Virgin Mary, apropos of the coming International Marian Congress to be held at Rome this year, with a full list of diocesan organizations affiliated to the Roman *Prima Primaria*. Regarding the book as a whole an immense amount of careful work must have gone to the production of this great mass of facts and statistics which have a bearing on the past and future as well as on the present, and which give an interest to every page. We might suggest for future issues the inclusion of the Brothers or "Temporal Coadjutors," of the Province, who are an integral part of the Society, at least in the general list of members at the end, and the continued publication of the Foreign Missions of the whole Society and the Statistical Table of its members. It would be well also to group the English Foreign Missions under one separate section. On the other hand, extended reviews of books, even of those connected with the Society, seem out of place in a publication of this sort. The typography is varied and striking and much better graduated than in the first edition, and the whole book of over 200 pages, with 50 additional pages of advertisements, is a marvel of cheapness.

A pamphlet of great importance to Catholics who have care of the sick has been written by the Rev. M. P. Bourke, A.M., LL.B., who is Superintendent of Hospitals for the Diocese of Detroit. Its title, **Some Medical Ethical Problems Solved** (Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee), indicates its subject-matter. According to its author it is an attempt to furnish concise and pointed answers to queries on sacramental and moral subjects in their relation to hospitals and the nursing profession. Its practical outcome is a "Code of Ethics for the operating-room and obstetrical department of Catholic Hospitals in the United States and Canada," which was adopted as official in 1921 by the Catholic Hospital Association. This Code enumerates operations which are contrary to sound morality, so that those concerned may prevent them, or at least refuse to take part in them.

MINOR PUBLICATIONS.

The **Catholic Mind** for December 22nd (America Press, 5 c.) reprints Father Meschler's long and beautiful Meditation on the Nativity from his "Life of our Lord," and an address on the Church's Divine Authority" by Archbishop Ireland. That for January 6th is mainly occupied by a powerfully-reasoned and fully-sustained indictment of materialistic civilization called "The Spirit of Lawlessness," by James M. Beck. In the Jan. 22nd issue we have the trenchant pastoral of Arch-

bishop Hayes against "The Sin of Birth-Control," and that of Feb. 8th contains an appreciation of Benedict XV. by J. C. Reville, S.J.

A useful summary of ceremonies for use in "small churches" on the Purification, Ash Wednesday, Palm Sunday, and Holy Week is contained in *Memoriale Rituum* (Marietti: 5.00 fr.), a slim and handy little volume very clearly printed.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Reviewed in present issue or reserved for future notice.)

- AMERICA PRESS, New York.
The Catholic Mind. Vol. xx. Nos. 2 and 3. Price 5c. each.
- ANGUS & ROBERTSON, Sydney.
Around the Boree Log. By John O'Brien. Pp. 162. Price, 6s.
- ARROWSMITH, Bristol.
False Psychical Claims in "The Gate of Remembrance." By H. J. Wilkins, D.D. Pp. 66. Price, 2s. 6d. net.
- BLACKWELL, Oxford.
The Roman Family. By S. A. Leathley, D.D. Pp. vii. 100. Price, 6s. net.
- BURNS, OATES & WASHBOURNE, London.
Liturgical Prayer: its history and spirit. By Fernand Cabrol, O.S.B. Pp. xiv. 382. Price, 12s. 6d. net.
Heaven on Earth. By Rev. D. G. Hubert. Pp. 301. Price, 3s. 6d.
St. Benedict. By Mme. J. A. Forbes. Pp. 121. Price, 2s. 6d. n.
- CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS.
An Introduction to Ecclesiastical Latin. By Rev. H. P. V. Nunn, M.A. Pp. xiii. 161. Price, 6s. net.
- GRIFFITHS & Co., London.
The Jesuit Directory for 1922. Pp. 211. Price, 1s. net.
- HARDING & MORE, London.
The Jesuits: 1534-1921. By T. J. Campbell, S.J. Pp. xvi. 930. Price, 25s.
- HERDER, London.
Handbook of Ceremonies. By J. B. Müller, S.J. 5th edition. Pp. xvi. 260. Price, 6s. net.
Father Tim's Talks. By C. D. McEnniry, C.S.S.R. Vol. III. Pp. 187. Price, 6s. net.
A Year with Christ. By W. J. Young, S.J. Pp. viii. 208. Price, 7s. 6d. net.
Story Sermonettes. By Rev. J. A. Reuter. Pp. viii. 200. Price, 7s. 6d. net.
My Master's Business. By Rev. D. L. Scully. Pp. 327. Price, 10s. n.
Three Fundamental Principles. By M. Meschler, S.J. 4 edit. Pp. viii. 290. Price, 5s. net.
- KENNY PRESS, Dublin.
The Clerical Student. By Rev. M. Hickey, D.D. Pp. 252. Price, 6s. 6d. post free.
- LIBRAIRIE DE L'ART CATHOLIQUE, Paris.
Le Génie du Rit Romain. By E. Bishop. Pp. 103. Price, 3.00 fr.
- LIBRAIRIE ISTRAT, Strasbourg.
L'Evolution Religieuse de Luther jusqu'en 1515. By Henri Strohl. Pp. 174. Price, 7.50 fr.
- LONGMANS, London.
Glories of the Love of Jesus. By Rev. Jesse Brett. Pp. 125. Price, 5s. net.
A Dream of Heaven. By R. Kane, S.J. Pp. viii. 222. Price, 6s. 6d. net.
Prayers in the Presence. By F. W. Drake. Pp. 53. Price, 1s. 6d. net.
- MACMILLAN & Co., London.
The Tragic Sense of Life. By M. de Unamuno, translated by J. E. Crawford Hitch, M.A. Pp. xxxv. 332. Price, 17s.
- PLON-NOURRIT ET CIE, Paris.
Les Dieux s'en Vont. Pp. iv. 302. Price, 7.00 fr.
- S.P.C.K., London.
Select Epistles of S. Cyprian. Edited by Canon Lacey. Pp. i. 178. Price, 8s. 6d. net.
- SOCIETY OF SS. PETER & PAUL, London.
The Adventure of Passion-tide. By Kenneth Ingram. Pp. 64. Price, 2s. 6d.
- SOCIETY OF ST. PETER CLAVER, Rome.
Vocation of an Auxiliary of the African Missions. Pp. xi. 40.
- VANPOULE, London.
The Roman Missal. Edited by Dom J. Cabrol, O.S.B. Pp. 1,500. Price, 15s. and upwards.

b.
on
n-
le

he
ne
e,

f.
e,

s,

t.
r.

r
l.

r.
s.
t.
e,
t.
e,

e
t.
y.

d
.

y
.

.

.